# HISTORY OF THE STRUGGLE FOR PARLIAMENTARY GOVERNMENT IN ENGLAND

00047725

BOMBAY BRANCH
OF THE
ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY
TOWN HALL, BOMBAY.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 18 July, 2018

# THE STRUGGLE FOR PARLIAMENTARY GOVERNMENT.

# THE HISTORY OF THE STRUGGLE FOR PARLIAMENTARY GOVERNMENT IN ENGLAND.

1236

BY

ANDREW BISSET.

47725
ac

*IN TWO VOLUMES.*

VOL. II.

HENRY S. KING & CO., LONDON.
1877.

942.
Bis His
47725

00047725

[*All rights reserved.*]

# CONTENTS.


## CHAPTER XII.

PAGE

FAIRFAX AND CROMWELL CHANGE THE FACE OF THE WAR—BY NO LONGER, LIKE ESSEX AND OTHERS, DEALING IN DRAWN BATTLES — MATERIALS OF THE PARLIAMENTARY ARMY AS RECONSTRUCTED BY CROMWELL — COMPARED WITH THE MATERIALS OF THE KING'S ARMY—CHADWICK, AS DESCRIBED BY MRS. HUTCHINSON, MIGHT HAVE SAT FOR SCOTT'S TRUSTY TOMKINS . . . . . 1

## CHAPTER XIII.

CROMWELL'S MODE OF USING HIS MILITARY MATERIALS—THE SKIRMISH AT GAINSBOROUGH, ETC.—CROMWELL APPOINTED LIEUTENANT-GENERAL TO THE EARL OF MANCHESTER—EMERGES FROM THE EASTERN COUNTIES—AND JOINS HIS FORCES TO THE FORCES EMPLOYED IN THE SIEGE OF YORK . 27

## CHAPTER XIV.

THE BATTLE OF MARSTON MOOR . . . . 43

## CHAPTER XV.

SECOND BATTLE OF NEWBURY—PRESBYTERIAN OLIGARCHY'S PLOT AGAINST CROMWELL—CROMWELL'S REMARKABLE SPEECH IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS, 9TH DECEMBER 1644—SELF-DENYING ORDINANCE — TREATY OF UXBRIDGE — EXECUTION OF LAUD . . . . . 79

## CHAPTER XVI.

THE HIGHLANDERS OF SCOTLAND—MONTROSE'S VICTORIES AND CRUELTIES . . . . . 97

## CHAPTER XVII.

PAGE

THE NEW MODEL OF THE PARLIAMENTARY ARMY—BATTLE OF NASEBY—MONTROSE'S SUCCESS AT AULDERNE, ALFORD, AND KILSYTH—HIS DEFEAT BY DAVID LESLIE AT PHILIPHAUGH—SUCCESSES OF FAIRFAX AND CROMWELL AFTER THE BATTLE OF NASEBY—SURRENDER OF BRISTOL—STORMING OF BASING HOUSE—THE KING'S INTRIGUES THROUGH THE EARL OF GLAMORGAN—END OF THE FIRST WAR—THE KING GOES TO THE SCOTS AT NEWARK, AND IS BY THEM DELIVERED UP TO THE ENGLISH PARLIAMENT—EPISCOPACY ABOLISHED—THE COURT OF WARDS ABOLISHED . . . . . 138

## CHAPTER XVIII.

MISREPRESENTATIONS OF THE ROYALISTS, PRESBYTERIANS, AND OTHERS RESPECTING CROMWELL AND IRETON . . . 180

## CHAPTER XIX.

STRUGGLE FOR POWER BETWEEN THE PRESBYTERIANS AND THE INDEPENDENTS—THE KING SEIZED BY JOYCE—THE KING'S NEGOTIATIONS AND INTRIGUES—MUTINY IN THE ARMY—QUELLED—THE ARMY MARCHES TO LONDON AND RESTORES THE MEMBERS OF BOTH HOUSES WHO HAD BEEN DRIVEN AWAY BY TUMULTS—THE KING'S FLIGHT TO THE ISLE OF WIGHT . 203

## CHAPTER XX.

THE SECOND CIVIL WAR—THE TREATY OF NEWPORT . . 257

## CHAPTER XXI.

REMONSTRANCE FROM THE ARMY FOR JUSTICE ON THE KING—PRIDE'S PURGE—CONDUCT OF VANE AND FAIRFAX ON THIS OCCASION . . . . . 283

## CHAPTER XXII.

THE KING'S TRIAL AND EXECUTION . . . . . 307

# HISTORY OF THE STRUGGLE FOR PARLIAMENTARY GOVERNMENT IN ENGLAND.

## CHAPTER XII.

*FAIRFAX AND CROMWELL CHANGE THE FACE OF THE WAR—BY NO LONGER, LIKE ESSEX AND OTHERS, DEALING IN DRAWN BATTLES—MATERIALS OF THE PARLIAMENTARY ARMY AS RECONSTRUCTED BY CROMWELL—COMPARED WITH THE MATERIALS OF THE KING'S ARMY—CHADWICK, AS DESCRIBED BY MRS. HUTCHINSON, MIGHT HAVE SAT FOR SCOTT'S TRUSTY TOMKINS.*

WE have now reached a critical point of time in the great war between the King and the Parliament of England. The two men who had been hitherto the leading spirits on the side of the Parliament had vanished from the scene. Hampden was dead, and Pym was dead; but they can hardly be said to have died before their work was done. In such business as the impeachment of Strafford and the carrying of the Grand Remonstrance, they had done their work well and thoroughly. But work of another kind had now to be done for which they were not equally well fitted; and two men were now coming upon the stage who were the men to do that work. For the great questions at issue between the two parties were

not to be solved, in that age at least, by parliamentary harangues and resolutions, but by blood and iron.

About this time, on the side of the parliament, two men began to make themselves conspicuous, of whom, as has been said of one of them,[1] it may be said as truly as of any men who ever lived, that they were born for victory. These were Sir Thomas Fairfax, son of Lord Fairfax, and Oliver Cromwell. On the breaking out of the war, Lord Fairfax having received a commission from the Parliament to be general of the forces in the north, his son, Sir Thomas, had a commission under him to be general of the horse. From the time that the younger Fairfax and Cromwell appeared prominently on the scene, the face of the war was totally changed, for those men did not deal in drawn battles, but destroyed and scattered their enemies wherever they encountered them. Their merits were, however, by no means equal; for though they were both able, as well as brave and valiant men, it was Cromwell who was the man of genius, and who saw what common men, among whom must be ranked Hampden as well as Essex, could not see—how to raise an army for the Parliament that should be invincible, when to the stubborn courage of Englishmen was joined the fierce religious enthusiasm of the Independents. Now, in describing these two men, Fairfax and Cromwell, it is to be noted that Cromwell could not have done his work as he did had he been a Presbyterian instead of an Independent, and liable to have his orders disputed, and his movements controlled, by a theocracy in the shape

[1] The first two lines of the Duke of Buckingham's poem on the death of Lord Fairfax, his father-in-law are—

"Under this stone does lie
One born for victory."

of a Kirk Commission, established at his headquarters. Whereas Fairfax, as it would appear, if not a Presbyterian himself, was completely under the control of a fanatical Presbyterian wife.

Sir Thomas Fairfax had received his early education from his uncle Edward Fairfax, from whose translation of Tasso, Dryden[1] informs us that he and many others had heard Waller own that he derived the harmony of his numbers, and who, unlike his family, who were mostly of a military turn, led a life of complete retirement at his native place, Denton, in Yorkshire, where his time was spent in literary pursuits and in the education of his own children and those of his brother, Lord Fairfax. He had then been sent to St. John's College, Cambridge, and as soon as he left college, he enlisted in the army of Lord Vere,[2] and served under his command in Holland.[3] When Fairfax returned to England he married Anne, the fourth daughter of Lord Vere. This lady was a rigid Presbyterian and exercised great influence over her husband.[4] It is generally said that Fairfax was a Presbyterian; but Mrs. Hutchinson, who had good means of knowing his religious opinions, says that his chaplains were Independent ministers, to whom Lady Fairfax was "exceedingly kind," till the "Presbyterian ministers quite changed the

[1] Preface to his "Fables."

[2] Horatio Vere, the youngest son of Geoffrey Vere, brother of John, sixteenth Earl of Oxford, created in 1625 Lord Vere of Tilbury.

[3] Biog. Brit., "Fairfax."

[4] Andrew Marvell, who resided some time in the house of Lord Fairfax, where, to borrow the words of Milton in a letter to Bradshaw, written on Marvell's behalf respecting the office of Latin Secretary, and dated February 21, 1652, "he was intrusted to give some instructions in the languages to the lady his daughter," in a poem entitled "Appleton House," a seat of Lord Fairfax, describes this daughter as—

> "In a domestic heaven nurs'd,
> Under the discipline severe
> Of Fairfax, and the starry Vere."

Marvell's Works, iii. 222. London, 4to, 1776.

lady into such a bitter aversion against them that they could not endure to come into the General's presence while she was there; and the General had an unquiet, unpleasant life with her, who drove away from him many of those friends in whose conversation he had found such sweetness."[1] Nor does it appear that Fairfax ever changed his religious opinions, but only suffered himself to be overruled by his wife. This working upon the fears and passions of women has always been the great weapon of Presbyterianism as of Romanism; and in this case, being brought to bear upon this distinguished soldier, and brave and honourable, but, in this point, weak man, produced an incalculable amount of public mischief. And if, as Socrates says in Plato's "Gorgias," it be a disgraceful thing to work by rhetoric on the passions of men, this working upon the passions of women, be they Lady Fairfaxes or Mause Headriggs, may be held to be still more disgraceful, and to be the very lowest and basest way in which a man can employ his mental faculties.

At the beginning of the struggle the Parliamentary armies appear, as I have said, to have been in general composed of materials inferior to those which composed the armies of the King. According to a great authority, the troops of the Parliament were most of them "old decayed serving-men and tapsters and such kind of fellows," while the King's troops were "gentlemen's sons, younger sons, and persons of quality." "Do you think," added the concise and practical reasoner who made the above remark, "that the spirits of such base and mean fellows will be ever able to encounter gentlemen that have honour and courage and resolution in them?"[2] At the battle of

[1] Mrs. Hutchinson's Memoirs of Colonel Hutchinson, pp. 298, 299. Bohn's edition. London, 1854.

[2] Oliver Cromwell's speech in the second conference with the Committee in regard to the title of King, 13th April 1657.

Newbury, however, the behaviour of the London trained bands showed conclusively that the armies of the Parliament had begun even by that time to be composed, in some part, at least, of materials very superior to old decayed serving-men and tapsters and such kind of fellows. Something more, however, was still needed to assure final victory in a struggle so arduous as that in which the Parliament of England was now engaged. I will now endeavour to show by what means that difficult end was attained. And as those means involve most momentous consequences, it will be necessary to treat the subject in some detail.

Oliver Cromwell was the son of Robert Cromwell, second son of Sir Henry Cromwell, Knight, of Hinchinbrook, in the county of Huntingdon. The wife of Robert, and the mother of Oliver Cromwell, was Elizabeth, daughter of William Steward of the city of Ely, a descendant of the Lord High Steward of Scotland, from whom the royal family of the Stuarts descended. William Hampden, the father of John Hampden, had married Elizabeth Cromwell, a daughter of Sir Henry Cromwell, and sister of Robert, the father of Oliver Cromwell. Consequently, John Hampden and Oliver Cromwell were first cousins. The provision which Robert Cromwell as a younger son inherited from his father being small and insufficient for the maintenance of his family, consisting of one son, Oliver, and six daughters, he purchased a brewery at Huntingdon and engaged in the business of a brewer.[1] This business was chiefly managed

[1] Mr. Sanford says (Studies and Illustrations of the Great Rebellion, p. 183) that the statement of a brewery having been carried on by Cromwell or his father or mother may be rejected as resting on no good evidence, and being irreconcilable with the habits and prejudices of the age. At the same time Mr. Sanford admits "that the brook of Hinchin, running through Robert Cromwell's premises, offered clear conveniences for malting or brewing; that

by his wife, Oliver Cromwell's mother, a woman of energy and talent for business, from whom the future statesman-soldier inherited—an inheritance which so many great men have owed to their mothers—both his intellectual power and his force of character.

Oliver Cromwell was born at Huntingdon, in the large Gothic house to which his father's brewery was attached, on the 25th of April 1599. He was therefore two or three years turned of forty when he took up the business of a soldier. At the age of seventeen he was sent from the grammar school of Huntingdon as a fellow-commoner to Sydney Sussex College, Cambridge, where he is said to have dis-

the house was occupied before it came into his possession by a Mr. Philip Clamp as a brewery; that the convenience of the brook and of the brewing apparatus may have induced him to brew for some of his neighbours while brewing for himself; and that hence may have arisen the stories among the Royalists of his having been a brewer by trade, a thing essentially different." But if, as is here admitted, he brewed for some of his neighbours, we may assume, as he was far from rich, that he did not make them a present of the beer he brewed for them. Consequently he brewed beer for sale. Whether that made him a brewer by trade in the sense of his depending on that trade solely for his subsistence, it made him a brewer by trade inasmuch as it must, unless he brewed gratuitously for his neighbours, have made some addition to his income. The matter is of no great moment, but I could produce abundant evidence that, however irreconcilable trade may have been with the habits and prejudices of that age, the younger sons of the gentry and of the nobility went into occupations which they would have rejected with disdain, when in the eighteenth century the Church and the Army, the Colonies and India opened a new field for them. To give an example, Dudley North, a younger son of the fourth Lord North, went into an occupation as little congenial to aristocratic prejudices as that of a brewer. I remember the time when the organs of the opposite party called Lord Durham "the small coal man," because he was an owner of coal-mines. But the trick of using the name of a trade or occupation as a term of reproach is not confined to monarchical England. And yet "we may affirm," says Mr. Grote, "with full assurance, that none of the much-decried demagogues of Athens—not one of those sellers of leather, lamps, sheep, ropes, pollard, and other commodities, upon whom Aristophanes heaps so many excellent jokes—ever surpassed, if they ever equalled, the impudence of this descendent of Æakus and Zeus [Alkibiades] in his manner of over-reaching and disgracing the Lacedæmonian envoys."—Grote's History of Greece, vii. 65.

tinguished himself more at football and cudgels than at the exercises of the schools. He left the university without taking a degree. No inference can be drawn from this circumstance with regard to Cromwell's literary acquirements, since almost all the young men of his class in that age—Eliot, Wentworth, Hampden, Pym, Ireton—left the university without taking a degree, and proceeded to one of the Inns of Court.

I am inclined to think that it was not unusual for young men, the eldest sons of country gentlemen, to reside in the Inns of Court without entering their names on the books. It is certain that Cromwell, after leaving the university of Cambridge, passed some time in London, it is said at Lincoln's Inn. His name does not appear on the books of that society. Nevertheless, he probably occupied chambers in Lincoln's Inn, since all the contemporary accounts, including the official inscription over the bed of state after his death, describe him as "of Lincoln's Inn."

In 1620, soon after he had completed his twenty-first year, Oliver Cromwell married Elizabeth Bourchier, daughter of Sir James Bourchier, of Felsted in Essex. His private fortune being insufficient for his support, he took an active part in the business of the brewery which his father had carried on at Huntingdon, and which his mother had continued after his father's death, which took place in 1617. This trade of brewer furnished a fertile topic for the scurrility of those who sought to make up with their pens for what their swords had failed to do for them. But Cromwell attended to other business besides brewing. He devoted himself to all the concerns, temporal and spiritual, of the small borough of Huntingdon in which he lived. His house became the refuge of Nonconformist ministers oppressed by the tyranny of Laud. Down to

a recent date a building was shown behind Cromwell's house in Huntingdon, which was said to have been built by him as a chapel for the disaffected, and in which he himself sometimes preached to them. In 1625, a portion of the electors of Huntingdon were of opinion that their fellow-townsman, Mr. Oliver Cromwell, who was "a common spokesman for sectaries, and maintained their part with stubbornness,"[1] though not gifted with a very sweet or fluent tongue, was capable of serving them in Parliament, for an unsucessful attempt was then made to get him returned. But in 1628 Cromwell was returned to Parliament for Huntingdon.

In 1631 Cromwell removed from Huntingdon with his wife and children to St. Ives, where he stocked a grazing farm with £1800 realised by the sale[2] of certain lands and tithes out of which his small patrimony was at that time derived. Those who know how much skill and experience and what unremitted vigilance and attention are necessary for the attainment of any degree of success in farming operations will be able to account for Oliver Cromwell's

[1] This was the description of Cromwell given by Williams to Charles I. in 1644. See Philips's Life of Archbishop Williams, p. 290. Also Hacket's Scrinia Reserata, or Life of Archbishop Williams, pt. ii. p. 212, folio. London, 1693.

[2] Mr. Noble says: "The reason of Sir Oliver and Mrs. Robert Cromwell, Cromwell's uncle and mother, joining in the deed is that the latter had a small jointure out of it, and that, with reference to the former, Sir Henry Cromwell had merely given or devised these premises to his son Robert, Oliver Cromwell's father, for a long term of years." From the abstract of the deed of conveyance furnished by Noble, which gives the parcels as they stand in the deed, omitting the general words, it would appear that the property was part of the plunder of the Church, bestowed by Henry VIII. on Cromwell's ancestor. So that, after all that has been said, the most really honourable portion of Oliver's subsistence, because derived from honest industry, and not from the plunder of national property, was that which was earned by the honest and useful, though, at that time, despised occupation of a brewer and a farmer.

not being a very prosperous farmer, without having recourse to the scurril version of the matter adopted or invented by Heath and followed by Hume. And even though a grazing farm, which Noble informs us, Cromwell's was, may be more easily managed than an arable one, still the difficulties would be such as to render success at least doubtful in the case of any man who had not been bred to the business. But the peculiarity above alluded to enables us to apply a test to the accuracy of the Royalist writers on Cromwell. Noble expressly says that Cromwell's farm at St. Ives was "a grazing farm." But Hume, following Heath, though he does not quote him or refer to him at the bottom of his page, says: "Though he had acquired a tolerable fortune by a maternal uncle, he found his affairs so injured by his expenses, that he was obliged to take a farm at St. Ives, and apply himself for some years to agriculture as a profession. But this expedient seemed rather to involve him in further debt and difficulties. The long prayers, which he said to his family in the morning, and again in the afternoon, consumed his own time and that of his ploughmen; and he reserved no leisure for the care of his temporal affairs."[1] This passage contains more misstatements than sentences. He did not acquire the "tolerable fortune by a maternal uncle" till 1635–36, when he left St. Ives to take possession of the property in and near Ely which then fell to him by the will of his maternal uncle, Sir Thomas Steward. If Noble is correct, which he is far more likely to be than Heath, though Cromwell would, of course, require labourers on his grazing-farm, he would not require "ploughmen." And for the statement of Cromwell's consuming all his labourers' time in long prayers there is no evidence what-

[1] Hist. of England, ch. lxi.

ever. Nor is it probable that a man who took such good care that his soldiers should not be praying when they ought to be fighting would have allowed his labourers to be such unprofitable servants as Heath and Hume represent them to have been. There are enough of intelligible reasons for his farm not prospering without supposing Cromwell a blockhead as well as a fanatic. And those who hate him most may call him a fanatic, and even a villain, but will hardly venture to call him a fool.

But whether or not Cromwell consumed much of his labourers' time in long prayers, there is reason to think that he consumed a part of it in the broad-sword exercise. The reason is this: Mr. Carlyle's correspondent, who forwarded to him the thirty-five unpublished letters of Oliver Cromwell, subjoins to one of them the following note gathered from his recollections of a journal of Mr. Samuel Squire, cornet, and auditor in Cromwell's regiment:—"Huntingdon regiment of horse. Each armed and horsed himself, except Mr. Oliver Cromwell's troop of Slepe[1] Dragoons, of some thirty to forty men, mostly poor men or very small freeholders. These the journal mentioned often; I mean the Slepe Troop of hard-handed fellows, who did as he told them, and asked no questions." Now these "Slepe Dragoons" would seem to have been the

[1] The Saxon name of St. Ives was "Slepe," by which name it is also distinguished in Domesday Book. St. Ives comprises the two manors of Slepe and Bustellers. When Oliver Cromwell rented the farm called the Wood Farm, at St. Ives, he lived in a house on the outskirts of the town, which does not now remain. Whether or not the house occupied by Oliver Cromwell was known by that name, the house which now stands on the site of Cromwell's residence was called by its owner "Slepe Hall;" the estate being the site of the ancient manor of Slepe.—Brayley's "Beauties of England and Wales," art. "St. Ives;" Lewis's "Topographical Dictionary," art. "St. Ives." In Walker's county map, "Slepe Hall" is inserted near St. Ives.

labourers of Cromwell's farm at St. Ives, with perhaps a few "very small freeholders" joined to them.

Mr. Sanford shows that the name "Ironsides" was given to Cromwell[1] himself, and not to his troops. He says, "The troops thus raised have been known in modern times as 'the Ironsides,' but as far as I can ascertain, this seems to have been a name given at first to Oliver himself. Thus in a newspaper of the time we read, 'This brave commander, by reason of his resolution and gallantry in his charges, is called by the King's soldiers Ironsides.' So Winstanley in his 'Worthies' says, 'One thing that made his brigade so invincible was his arming them so well, as whilst they assured themselves they could not be overcome, it assured them to overcome their enemies. He himself, as they called him Ironside, needed not to be ashamed of a nickname that so often saved his life. Heath also calls him by that name, and not his troops."[2]

The account given in the note to Cornet Squire's journal of Cromwell's Slepe Troop of Dragoons agrees exactly with the distinction existing at that time between horse and dragoons; and it is necessary here to guard the reader against the supposition that the term "dragoons" had at that time the meaning which it has at present. When the musket or portable firearm was first introduced in war, an exaggerated notion was entertained of its powers, and great effects were expected from mounting musketeers on horseback for the purpose of being speedily conveyed to any point where their services might be required, and where they might then act either on horse-

[1] The name "Stonewall" Jackson is a parallel case.

[2] Studies and Illustrations of the Great Rebellion, p. 538. London, J. W. Parker & Son, 1858.

back or on foot.[1] Thus in these wars a party of dragoons were always, or almost always, considered a necessary adjunct to what was called the "horse." The old distinction between "horse" and "dragoons" is kept up, at least upon paper, to this day in the expression in the Mutiny Acts, "horse, foot, and dragoons," as implying three distinct classes of troops. As it was not essential to the original service of the dragoons that they should be mounted on the best[2] or strongest horses, their horses were of an inferior description to those of the "horse" or cavalry. One of their uses at that time was to perform the duty of outposts and detachments, and do the "rough and ready" work of the attack on a difficult pass, a bridge, or any post that was not strong enough to require a regular and protracted siege with the use of heavy

[1] This rough and ready character agrees well with the above description of the "Slepe Troop of hard-handed fellows."

[2] It is remarkable that those counties, in regard to which the law of Henry VIII. for promoting the breed of large horses was altered by the statute 8 Eliz. c. 8, as being counties which, as the preamble recites, "on account of their rottenness, unfirmness, moisture, and waterishness, were not able to breed or bear horses of such a size," should, under Oliver Cromwell's management, have produced such cavalry; for, though horses of an inferior description might suit his troop of "Slepe Dragoons," such horses would not suit his Huntingdon regiment of horse. Some of the regulations of the statute of Henry VIII. above referred to (33 Henry VIII. c. 5) are curious. Every archbishop and duke is obliged, under penalties, to have seven stoned trotting horses for the saddle, each of which is to be fourteen hands high at the age of three years. There are many minute directions with regard to the number of the same kind of horses to be kept by other ranks. The lowest class mentioned is that of a spiritual person having benefices to the amount of £100 per annum, or a layman whose wife shall wear any French hood or bonnet of velvet; such are obliged (under the penalty of £20) to have one trotting stone-horse for the saddle. This statute continued in force till the 21 of James I., when it was repealed by the statute of that date, which is characterised by Barrington (Observations on the Statutes, p. 499, note, 5th edition, 1796) as "the most comprehensive act of repeal in the statute-book." It had, indeed, previously been altered as to the Isle of Ely, Cambridgeshire, and other counties, by the statute 8 Eliz. c. 8, referred to above.

artillery. Another of their uses was, in battles and skirmishes, to dismount and line the hedges or thickets. Thus in the plan of the battle of Naseby, given in Sprigg's "Anglia Rediviva," the dragoons are seen lining the hedges, with their horses picketed near them. The dragoons at that time, though very useful in the way mentioned, were not considered on an equal footing with either the horse or pikemen. The dragoons were employed in much smaller numbers than the horse, the proportion being about fifty dragoons to five hundred horse. They were also formed from a different class of men from that out of which the "horse" were formed, as is intimated by the fact stated above of the formation of Cromwell's troop of Slepe Dragoons from the labourers on his farm at St. Ives, while the horse were formed, in part, at least, of freeholders and freeholders' and gentlemen's sons, and in the King's army of the gentry themselves. I am indebted to an English general officer for some valuable observations on this subject, from which I extract the following explanation of the cause of the term dragoons rather than horse being now the term in use in the English army: —"It is a curious thing that, after all, the dragoons should have carried the day against the horse; which can only be accounted for on the supposition that, in one way or other, they made themselves the most useful. The present regiments of heavy cavalry were all of them, with the exception of what are called the 'Horse Guards Blue' and the 'Life Guards,' styled dragoon-guards and dragoons. It is very likely that the refusal of the 'horse' to act on foot had something to do with the preference given to the dragoons."

It will be of use to add here what I may have to state more in detail hereafter, that the foot regiments at that

time were composed partly of musketeers and partly of pikemen; and that, though the pikemen formed only about two-fifths[1] of every regiment, the work which fell to the infantry had, from the inefficiency of the musket and the want of the bayonet, to be done chiefly by the pikemen, who were generally the tallest and strongest men. The pikes being from 15 to 18 feet in length, and of considerable weight, required men of strength as well as height rather above the average to handle them efficiently. The efficiency of the musketeers was still further diminished by the facts that a large proportion of their muskets were matchlocks, not flintlocks, and that the ball was put loose into the barrel, and, not fitting tight, was apt to fall out if the barrel was lowered below the horizontal line.[2]

Oliver Cromwell in after years lost the confidence and esteem of many brave and honourable men. In the times of which we now write, one thing is certain, that while Cromwell's wrath was dangerous to many, his wisdom and courage afforded shelter and safety to many also. It is also shown by abundant evidence that, whatever he may have been in his later years, never man had a larger portion of hatred and defiance for the oppressor, of helpful compassion for the oppressed, and dauntless resolution to redress their wrongs and punish their oppressors, than Oliver Cromwell in his earlier days.

The first time that Hyde condescended to become aware of the existence of the Member for Cambridge was when, as he relates in a passage of his Life, often

[1] It appears from two minutes in the Order Book of the Council of State, that in a regiment of foot 1000 strong, there were 600 musketeers and 400 pikemen.—13th March $164\frac{8}{9}$, M.S., State Paper Office.

[2] Memoires de Montecuculi, i. 2, 16. Grose's Military Antiquities, i. 132, 133. The authorities for the statements in the text will be given more in detail in subsequent pages.

quoted, he sat as chairman of a committee of which Cromwell was a member, "upon an enclosure which had been made of great wastes, belonging to the Queen's manors, without the consent of the tenants, against which, as well the inhabitants of other manors who claimed common in those wastes, as the Queen's tenants of the same, made loud complaints, as a great oppression, carried upon them with a very high hand, and supported by power."[1] Hyde then goes on to relate that Oliver Cromwell (who had never before been heard to speak in the House of Commons[2]), being one of the committee, "appeared much concerned to countenance the petitioners, who were numerous, together with their witnesses," that "Cromwell, in great fury, reproached the chairman for being partial," and that "in the end his whole carriage was so tempestuous, and his behaviour so insolent, that the chairman found himself obliged to reprehend him—which he never forgave." This looks as if it were a good likeness of a man of fiery temper and strong character, resisting what he considered oppression. In the words, "which he never forgave," Hyde would have it appear that on that occasion he made Cromwell his enemy, but he might have said as truly, "which Mr. Hyde never forgave," for Cromwell certainly on this occasion made himself an enemy, but not an enemy powerful enough to oppose, much less to crush him, while he lived; though able to do something, when he ceased to live, to blacken his memory—but for that Cromwell probably cared but little.

[1] Clarendon's Life, i. 88. Oxford, 1827.

[2] Even in the Parliamentary History a short speech of "Mr. Oliver Cromwell" is given as far back as 1628; and Mr. Sanford has published abundant evidence from D'Ewes' MS. Journal of the Long Parliament and other MS. sources that this statement of Clarendon is quite untrue.—See Sanford's Studies and Illustrations of the Great Rebellion, pp. 319, 320, also p. 309, and the long note beginning at the foot of p. 369.

This feature of his character, his "tenderness towards sufferers," to borrow the words of one[1] who knew him, is also shown in the stubbornness with which he defended sectaries before Archbishop (then Bishop) Williams, and still more signally in the prompt and energetic measures he adopted, in conjunction with Colonel Hutchinson, to punish the younger Hotham for his oppression and plunder of the people of Nottingham and the surrounding country. Another remarkable exercise of the same quality occurred in the matter of the *Bedford Level.* The Earl of Bedford and other noblemen had proposed a scheme for draining the extensive fens which at that time covered some millions of acres in the counties of Cambridge, Huntingdon, Northampton, and Lincoln. That part commonly called the Bedford Level, and containing nearly 400,000 acres, had been completed, when a proposition was made to the Crown, offering a fair proportion of the land for its assistance and authority in the completion of the whole. This was far too tempting an opportunity for grasping both at power and revenue to be neglected by Charles and his ministers, who were then attempting to govern England without Parliaments. A body of Crown-appointed commissioners forthwith arrived in the districts, held courts for the adjudication of claims connected in any way, however remote, with the property in question, decided, of course, all the questions in the King's favour, and, it is said, proposed to dispute with the Earl of Bedford and the other movers of the undertaking their retention of 95,000 acres of the land already recovered in compensation of the risk they had incurred.[2]

[1] Letter in the Appendix to the first volume of Thurloe's State Papers, p. 766.

[2] Life and Times of Cromwell, by Thomas Cromwell, p. 68. Cited in Mr. Forster's Life of Oliver Cromwell, i. 59.

Whether before the interference of the Crown commissioners the peasants had complained of the proposed measure as depriving them of their rights of common in those extensive wastes, does not appear; but the accounts agree that at this stage of the business the common people began to complain loudly, and to clamour for justice. Meetings were held, in the proceedings of which Oliver Cromwell took an active part; and the project of enriching the Crown and the noblemen-projectors, for that time at least, fell to the ground."[1]

But it was not often that the poor could hope for so powerful an advocate as Oliver Cromwell at this time was. That confiscation, not only of their ancient rights of common, but also of their separate lands, had commenced, and went on with increasing rapidity, which by the end of the seventeenth century had vastly reduced the number of yeomanry or small landed proprietors, regarded by contemporary chroniclers as the main strength of the country, both in war and in peace. Throughout the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, small proprietors were either oppressed with actual force, or circumvented by fraud, or wearied out of their possessions by injuries. We have the authority of Sir Thomas More[2] and others for these things in the sixteenth century, and the authority of several cases in Rushworth that they continued to be done in the seventeenth century. The large proprietors, if they designed, for instance, to enclose a common, threatened to make the small proprietors "run the country" if they would not sell their lands and yield up their houses. And with that view they broke their fences, and then put them to grievous law expenses for the trespass committed by their cattle. In

[1] Forster's Life of Oliver Cromwell, i. 59, 60.
[2] Mor. Utop., lib. i.

one case given in Rushworth[1] the rich man caused his servants to pull down the house of one of the poor man's witnesses, "none being therein but a child, who ran out naked, and his wife and children lay in the streets a night or two, none daring to receive them, and being afterwards, by a justice's direction, received into a house, the rich man so threatened the owner that he turned them out of doors, and all the winter they lay in an outhouse without fire, so that he, his wife, and one child died. And the rich man beat another of the witnesses so as she could not put on her clothes for a month after; another of the witnesses he threatened to fire his house or pull it down."[2]

When Oliver Cromwell received a commission to raise a troop[3] of horse for the Parliament, he entered upon this

[1] Rushworth, abrid., ii. 191.

[2] It thus appears that Massinger's Sir Giles Overreach is, in fact, no exaggeration, and Sir Giles's scheme for compelling his neighbour, Mr. Frugal, to sell his manor against his will, was followed to the letter by many men whose deeds would fill an authentic volume :—

"I'll therefore buy some cottage near his manor;
Which done, I'll make my men break ope' his fences;
Ride o'er his standing corn, and in the night
Set fire to his barns, or break his cattle's legs;
These trespasses draw on suits, and suits expenses,
Which I can spare, but will soon beggar him.
When I have harried him thus two or three year,
Though he sue *in forma pauperis*, in spite
Of all his thrift and care, he'll grow behind-hand.
Then with the favour of my man of law,
I will pretend some title; want will force him
To put it to arbitrement; then, if he sell
For half the value, he shall have ready money,
And I possess his land."

[3] Mr. Forster observes (Life of Oliver Cromwell, i. 94) that though Cromwell styles himself a captain of a troop of horse, he cannot discover that he ever held such a commission under Essex. The following passage, however, given in "Cromwelliana," p. 2, from the "Perfect Diurnal" of September 13, 1642, shows that at that time Cromwell held a captain's commission :—"The committee appointed to settle the affairs of the kingdom appointed that Captains Cromwell, Austin, and Draper, should forthwith muster their troops of horse,

new business, which was henceforth to be the principal business of his life, when he was turned of forty. But being a man of original as well as powerful mind, in other words, a man of genius, he soon saw, what the common herd of men, of whatever rank or whatever military education or experience, it seemed, did not see, that an army is a machine, and resembles other machines in this,—that the strength and efficiency of it depends on the strength and efficiency of the smallest parts of which it is composed. Cromwell, to use his own words, "in a way of foolish simplicity (as it was judged by very great and wise men, and good men too), desired to make his instruments to help him in this work." To which end, he declined to enlist under his colours "old decayed serving-men, and tapsters, and such kind of fellows," but "raised such men as had the fear of God before them, and made some conscience of what they did." Cromwell was soon promoted to the rank of colonel, and his troop he augmented to a regiment; still employing the utmost care to obtain the same kind of materials, which he spared no pains to improve, making use of old foreign soldiers to drill them, and introducing the strictest discipline, himself setting them the example of incessant activity, unflinching courage, and unremitting attention to duty.

From an expression of Whitelocke, "he had a brave regiment of horse, most of them freeholders and freeholders' sons," it seems to have been inferred that the

and make themselves ready to go to his Excellence the Earl of Essex." In the same Journal, in the beginning of the following March, he is designated, "Colonel Cromwell." May also expressly says that Cromwell, "by a commission from the Parliament and Lord-General Essex had raised a troop of horse."—Hist. of the Parl., bk. iii. ch. iv. p. 206, ed. Maseres. London, 1812. And Richard Baxter distinctly mentions him as "at his first entrance into the wars being but a captain of horse."—The Life of the Rev. Mr. Richard Baxter, part i., p. 98, folio. London, 1696.

bulk of Cromwell's soldiers were rather of the agricultural than commercial class. However, the expression of Denzil Holles,[1] and the known facts, show a result of no small importance. For they prove—in direct opposition to the opinion, by whomsoever held, bearing some affinity to the contempt of Rob Roy's wife for Baillie Nicol Jarvie and Glasgow weavers—that men engaged in the occupation of tradesmen would make but indifferent soldiers compared with wild Highlanders, and "persons of quality,"—that an army composed in part and officered in great part by tradesmen, might utterly defeat and break in pieces armies composed of warlike Highlanders, and of high-spirited gentlemen used to the sword-exercise and to ride to hounds.

Denzil Holles, as he was not ashamed to sit as a judge on a trial of life or death of the men with whom he had once acted, was also not ashamed to denominate the army of the Parliament of England "a notable dunghill." I cannot resist the temptation to contrast with the words applied to that army by Denzil Lord Holles, the words applied to it by Thomas Babington Lord Macaulay:—"From the time when the army was remodelled to the time when it was disbanded, it never found, either in the

[1] Though part of Holles's statement has been already given, it will be convenient to give the whole of it here:—"Most of the colonels and officers mean tradesmen, brewers, tailors, goldsmiths, shoemakers, and the like; a notable dunghill, if one would rake into it, to find out their several pedigrees."—Memoirs of Denzil Lord Holles, p. 149. London, 1699. Pepys says in his Diary (November 9, 1663), "Of all the old army now you cannot see a man begging about the streets; but what?—you shall have this captain turned a shoemaker, the lieutenant a baker; this a brewer, that a haberdasher; this common soldier a porter; and every man in his apron and frock, &c., as if they never had done anything else; whereas the other [the King's army] go with their belts and swords, swearing, and cursing, and stealing." In many other places of his Diary, Pepys speaks of those Parliamentary soldiers as the men that "must do the King's business" when any hard fighting was in question, and not the "gay men" who composed his guards, &c.

British Islands or on the Continent, an enemy who could stand its onset. In England, Scotland, Ireland, Flanders, the Puritan warriors, often surrounded by difficulties, sometimes contending against threefold odds, not only never failed to conquer, but never failed to destroy and break in pieces whatever force was opposed to them. They at length came to regard the day of battle as the day of certain triumph, and marched against the most renowned battalions of Europe with disdainful confidence. Turenne was startled by the shout of stern exultation with which his English allies advanced to the combat, and expressed the delight of a true soldier when he learned that it was ever the fashion of Cromwell's pikemen to rejoice greatly when they beheld the enemy; and the banished cavaliers felt an emotion of national pride when they saw a brigade of their countrymen, outnumbered by foes and abandoned by friends, drive before it in headlong rout the finest infantry of Spain, and force a passage into a counterscarp which had just been pronounced impregnable by the ablest of the Marshals of France."[1]

Before I leave this part of the subject I will make another short extract from Denzil Holles's Memoirs. We have seen in what terms Lord Macaulay describes the military qualities of these soldiers of the Parliament and of Cromwell. On the other side, Denzil Holles, after calling them "a notable dunghill," proceeds to say, that it was a monstrous thing for "these to rebel against their masters, put conditions upon them, upon the King, and whole kingdom, make their will a rule, that all the interests of the King, Parliament, and kingdom must be squared by."

[1] Macaulay's History of England, i. 58, 59. London, 1864. This exquisite passage proves that Macaulay possessed his full share of—to borrow his own words (Trevelyan's Life, &c., ii. 409)—"those higher graces of style which delight us in Plato, in Demosthenes, and in Pascal."

Now let us see what were these interests which Denzil Holles calls "the interests of the King and kingdom."[1] These interests were the interests of foreigners, of the King, who was not an Englishman, and of the Queen, who was half French and half Italian. There were indeed times when England had been ruled by foreigners. It had been ruled by William I., by Henry II., and by Simon de Montfort. But those were all foreigners of a high type, whereas now it was proposed by such statesmen as Denzil Holles, Hyde, and others of similar principles, that England should be ruled by foreigners of a low type—a result which, if such an army of native Englishmen as has been described, *and their leader*, remained true to themselves, could never be accomplished. How it was accomplished long after, it were sad to tell; but the hour of its accomplishment was at the time of which I now write far distant.

What Sir Henry Vane said of himself on the scaffold, that he was in his youthful days inclined as well as others to the vanities of this world, and to that which they call good fellowship, probably comprehends nearly all that is quite true in those strange stories that have been told of the wildness and profligacy of Cromwell's early life. Richard Baxter has probably come near to the true character of Cromwell when he says: "I think that having been a prodigal in his youth, and afterwards changed to a zealous religiousness, he meant honestly in the main, and was pious and conscionable in the main course of his life, till prosperity and success corrupted him: that at his first entrance into the wars, being but a captain of horse, he had a special care to get religious men into his troop."[2]

[1] Memoirs of Denzil Lord Holles, p. 149.

[2] The Life of the Rev. Mr. Richard Baxter, part i. p. 98. London, folio, 1696.

The besetting sins of the King's army were intemperance and an excess in all debauchery, vices which were to be expected as the natural inheritance which would descend to them from their fathers, who had had the great misfortune to learn the Court fashion of the infamous Court of James.[1] Some eminent writers have exerted their abilities to throw an attractive air over those vices of the Royalists, keeping, of course, the darker parts of them out of their pictures. But while it may be true that debauchery and intemperance are not inconsistent with personal courage, the experience of all history teaches us that an excess of sensuality is absolutely incompatible with a healthy, a well-regulated, and permanent constitution of government. When the Athenian Plato, though not accustomed to behold at Athens any very high standard of abstinence from luxury, revisited Sicily and Italy, he was disgusted[2] at the life of indulgence and luxury which prevailed generally among wealthy Greeks in Sicily and Italy; and he came to the conclusion that no state, of which the citizens indulge in such habits, can remain quiet[3] under a just government and equal laws, but must be changing incessantly from one kind of bad government

[1] "The generality of the gentry of the land soon learned the Court fashion, and every great house in the country became a sty of uncleanness. Then began murder, incest, adultery, drunkenness, swearing, fornication, and all sort of ribaldry, to be no concealed but countenanced vices, because they held such conformity with the Court example."—Mrs. Hutchinson's Memoirs of Colonel Hutchinson, p. 78. Bohn's edition. London, 1854. And again (ibid., p. 80), "Those sermons only pleasing that flattered them in their vices, and told the poor King that he was Solomon, and that his sloth and cowardice, by which he betrayed the cause of God and honour of the nation, was gospel meekness and peaceableness; for which they raised him up above the heavens, while he lay wallowing like a swine in the mire of his lust."

[2] Plato's expression of dissatisfaction, *οὐδαμῇ οὐδαμῶς ἤρεσε*, is as strong as that of Tillières respecting the disgusting sensuality of King James, "deplait horriblement."—Tillières in Raumer, ii. 274.

[3] Plato, Epistol., vii. 326.

to another, whether that government be a monarchical, an oligarchical, or a democratical tyranny. Great, then, as was the contrast between the imbecility of the Stuarts and the consummate skill with which Dionysius the Elder and Agathokles played the tyrant's game, Dionysius himself could not have begun his work more effectually than the Stuarts did by the force of the example of the Court of James upon the nobility and gentry of England.

If, however, to the characteristic vices of the Royalists be added hypocrisy, the result is a type of character more thoroughly bad than the worst among the Royalists, and for such type we must look to the party of the Parliament. To say nothing here of those arch-traitors, the consummation of whose treachery and baseness belongs to the last act of the drama of the Long Parliament, there were not a few smaller if not meaner villains, whose characters, recorded by witnesses of unimpeached veracity, prove that Sir Walter Scott's character of *Trusty Tomkins* in "Woodstock" is not much, if at all, overdrawn. Mrs. Hutchinson, in her Memoirs of her husband, Colonel Hutchinson, has drawn, with no feeble hand, the portraits of several of those bad men who joined the side of the Parliament, not for public and honourable, but for private and sinister ends. Among these stood pre-eminent one Chadwick, who, from a boy that scraped trenchers in the house of one of the poorest justices in the county of Nottingham, had procured himself to be deputy-recorder of Nottingham, cutting his hair, and "taking up a form of godliness, the better to deceive." Whether or not, like Trusty Tomkins, Chadwick held the peculiar doctrines which were in those times entertained by a sect sometimes termed the Family of Love, but more commonly Ranters, the latter resembled the former in his character of a

hypocritical libertine, as well as of a treacherous ally. "In some of the corrupt times he had purchased the honour of a barrister, though he had neither law nor learning, but he had a voluble tongue and was crafty; but although he got abundance of money by a thousand cheats and other base ways, wherein he exercised all his life, he was as great a prodigal in spending as knave in getting." Of this Chadwick, who may be regarded as the type of a considerable class at that time, Mrs. Hutchinson thus sums up the character: "Never was a truer Judas since Iscariot's time than he, for he would kiss the man he had in his heart to kill, he naturally delighting in mischief and treachery; and was so exquisite a villain, that he destroyed those designs he might have thriven by, with overlaying them with fresh knaveries. I have been," adds Mrs. Hutchinson, "a little tedious in these descriptions, yet have spoken very little in comparison of what the truth would bear; indeed, such assistants as these were enough to disgrace the best cause by their owning of it."[1] In one of the feats related of this Chadwick by Mrs. Hutchinson he soared considerably above Trusty Tomkins, and even approached Sir John Falstaff. Chadwick, being sent by the Committee of Nottingham to the Lord Fairfax for the purpose of procuring some help towards the defence of Nottingham, when Newcastle was daily expected to attack it, instead of prosecuting this business, procured himself a commission for a regiment. "In execution of this commission he raised seven men, who were his menial servants, went into Staffordshire, took possession of a Papist's fine house, and set fire to it to run away by the light when the enemy were thirty miles off from it."

[1] Memoirs of Colonel Hutchinson, pp. 135, 136. Bohn's edition. London, 1854.

"He also cheated the country of pay," adds Mrs. Hutchinson, "for I know not how many hundred men, for which, if he had not stolen away in the night, he had been stoned; and as his wife passed through the towns she was in danger of her life, the women flinging scalding water after her."[1]

[1] Memoirs of Colonel Hutchinson, pp. 191, 192. Bohn's edition. London, 1854.

## CHAPTER XIII.

*CROMWELL'S MODE OF USING HIS MILITARY MATERIALS—THE SKIRMISH AT GAINSBOROUGH, ETC.—CROMWELL APPOINTED LIEUTENANT-GENERAL TO THE EARL OF MANCHESTER—EMERGES FROM THE EASTERN COUNTIES, AND JOINS HIS FORCES TO THE FORCES EMPLOYED IN THE SIEGE OF YORK.*

FOR that particular portion of the war of which I now desire to give some account, by far the best and most valuable, as well as most interesting, history would have been that old "Journal by Samuel Squire," which, as Mr. Carlyle was informed by a credible witness, "went to 200 folio pages;" but which his unknown correspondent, after copying out of it, and sending to him thirty-five letters of Oliver Cromwell, burnt to ashes. Mr. Carlyle first published these thirty-five letters of Oliver Cromwell in *Fraser's Magazine* for December 1847, with an introduction giving an account of the singular circumstances under which they had come into his hands. I read these letters with great interest when they were first published, and I have often read them since; and to me they have always appeared, from the first perusal to the last, to bear all the internal marks of genuine authenticity. It would be extremely difficult for any forger of historical documents to accomplish even an approach to the rough, idiomatic, vigorous, and abrupt business-like brevity which are stamped upon the style of these letters, as if the hand of the writer were as strong and firm as his mind was clear and rapid; and

as if his mind, though then occupied with but narrow and limited interests, was capable of commanding armies and ruling empires. Thus in one of these letters, written from London about two months before the war broke out, to the Committee of Association at Cambridge, he says:—"V. says that many come ill to the time fixed for muster: pray heed well their loss of time; for I assure you, if once we let time pass by, we shall seek in vain to recover it. The Lord helpeth those who heed His commandments: and those who are not punctual in small matters, of what account are they when it shall please Him to call us forth, if we be not watchful and ready? Pray beat up those sluggards—I shall be over, if it please God, next Tuesday or Wednesday." In the letter placed next to that just quoted, and to which Mr. Carlyle has put the date July 1642—as to the preceding he put the date June 1642—Cromwell writes: "I have sent you 300 more carbines, and 600 snaplances;[1] also 300 lances, which, when complete, I shall send down by the train with sixteen barrels powder. We [of the Parliament] declare ourselves now, and raise an army forthwith: Essex and Bedford are our men. Throw off fear, as I shall be with you. I get a troop ready to begin; *and they will show the others.*[2]

[1] In explanation of this term I subjoin an extract from my "History of the Commonwealth," i. 66-68. "The foot regiments at that time were composed partly of musketeers, partly of pikemen, and though the musketeers formed a larger proportion of each regiment than the pikemen, the work—in consequence of the inefficiency of the muskets, a large proportion of which were matchlocks, not flintlocks or snaplances, and the want of the bayonets—was mostly done by the pikemen. It appears from the Order Book of the Council of State, 13th March 164⅝, MS. State Paper Office, that the pikemen in a regiment of foot 1000 strong were to the musketeers as 400 to 600, or as two-fifths to three-fifths. It appears from a despatch of Cromwell from Linlithgow to the Council of State, 26th July 1651, that they 'have left in store 2030 muskets, whereof thirty snaplances,' or flintlocks."

[2] I have underlined these words as showing how early Cromwell had formed his plan as to fit materials for the army of the Parliament.

Truly I feel I am Siloam of the Lord; my soul is with you in the cause. I sought the Lord, and found this written in the first chapter of Zephaniah, the 3rd verse: 'See, I will consume man and beast; I will consume the fowls of heaven, and the fishes of the sea, and the stumblingblocks of the wicked; and I will cut off man from off the land, saith the Lord.' Surely it is a sign for us. So I read it. For I seek daily, and I do nothing without first so seeking the Lord."

The familiar knowledge shown in these letters as possessed by Cromwell of his neighbours living in Huntingdon, St. Neots, St. Ives, Ely, Biggleswade, and other towns or villages of the counties of Huntingdon, Cambridge, Bedford, and even Lincoln and Northampton, and the interest taken by him in their affairs, could hardly have been found in Cromwell if he had been merely a country gentleman or landowner who leased his land to tenant-farmers. But as a brewer first, and afterwards as a gentleman-farmer—that is, as a man farming his own land—Cromwell saw far greater varieties of human character than he would have seen as a country squire; and he also had more need for the exercise of his wits. He was brought into closer and more frequent dealings with farm-labourers and yeomen; and he had to go to market and bargain with cattle-dealers and corn-factors.

Since I first read these thirty-five letters, it has always appeared to me that the genuine features of the character of Cromwell—in other words, those qualities which made him the leading figure in that great struggle of the seventeenth century—are more thoroughly brought out and manifested in them than in any other record of that time. No words but Cromwell's own, in his brief, abrupt, and hastily-written but clear and business-like letters or notes

to Mr. Samuel Squire—subsequently Cornet and Auditor Squire—can convey the same impression. I will endeavour to give at least some idea by a few short extracts.

From Ely, 11th April 1642, he thus writes to the Committee of some place, for the address is wanting—"Be sure and put up with no affronts. Be as a bundle of sticks; let the offence to one be as to all. The Parliament will back us."

From Wisbeach, 11th Nov. 1642, he writes thus to Squire—"Dear Friend, let the sadler see to the horse-gear. I learn, from one, many are ill-served. If a man has not good weapons, horse and harness, he is as nought." The following, dated the same day to the same person, seems to show that Cromwell, between Sept.[1] 13 and Nov. 11, had increased his troop of horse to a regiment—"Take three troops and go to Downham; I care not which they be." From the next to "Mr. Samuel Squire, at his quarters at Stanground," dated 29th Nov. 1642, I extract only one line:—"Tell W. I will not have his men cut folk's grass without compensation. Bid R. horse any who offend; say it is my order, and show him this." The next I give entire is "For Captain Berry, at his quarters, Oundle, *Haste*" [date gone by moths—dated by Mr. Carlyle "12th March $164\frac{2}{3}$"]—"Dear Friend, we have secret and sure hints that a meeting of the Malignants takes place at Lowestoff on Tuesday. Now I want your aid; so come with all speed on getting this, with your troop; and tell no one your route, but let me see you ere sundown.—From your friend and commandant, Oliver Cromwell." Of the next to Cornet Squire, 15th March $164\frac{2}{3}$, I give the first paragraph—"Dear Friend, I have no great mind to take Montague's [afterwards Earl of Sandwich] word about that farm. I learn,

[1] See note in the last chapter,

behind the oven is the place they hide them [the arms]; so watch well, and take what the man leaves; and hang the fellow out-a-hand, and I am your warrant. For he shot a boy at Stilton-bee by the Spinney, the widow's son, her only support: so God and man must rejoice at his punishment. I want you to go over to Stamford: they do not well know you; ride through and learn all—Wildman is gone by way of Lincoln: you may meet; but do not know him; he will not you." From the next to the same, dated 30th March 1643—"Mind and come on in strength, as they are out on mischief. Tell Berry to ride in, also Montague; and cut home, as no mercy ought to be shown those rovers, who are only robbers, and not honourable soldiers. Call at Cosey (?); I learn he has got a case of arms down; fetch them off; also his harness—it lies in the wall by his bed-head: fetch it off; but move not his old weapons of his father's, or his family trophies. Be tender of this, as you respect my wishes of one gentleman to another. Bring me two pair of boothose from the Fleming's who lives in London Lane [Norwich]; also a new cravat." To the same—that is, "Mr. Samuel Squire, at his quarters, Peterborough, in Bridge Street there: *Haste.*" "St. Neot's, 3d April 1643.—Dear Sir, I am required by the Speaker to send up those prisoners we got in Suffolk; pray send in the date we got them, also their names in full, and quality. I expect I may have to go up to town also. I send them up by Whalley's troop and the Slepe troop; my son goes with them. You had best go also, to answer any questions needed. I shall require a new pot [helmet]; mine is ill set. Buy me one in Tower Street; a Fleming sells them, I think his name is Vandeleur; get one *fluted*, and good barrets; and let the plume-case be set on well behind. I would prefer it lined with good shamoy-leather to any

other." To the same—"Stilton, 12th April, *post haste, haste.* Sir, Pray show this to Berry, and advise him to ride in, and join me, by four days' time; as these Ca'ndishers, I hear, are over, tearing and robbing all, poor and rich. . . . Many poor souls slain and cattle moved off—send on word to Biggleswade, to hasten those slow fellows. We are upon no child's-play. I will buy your Spanish headpiece you showed me; I will give you five pieces for it, and my Scots one." To the same 13th April 1643—"I find we want much ere we march. Our smiths are hard at work at shoes. Press me four more smiths as you come on. I must have them, yea or nay; say I will pay them fee, and let go after shoeing—home, and no hindrances." To the same (date wanting), but soon after the last—"I fear those men from Suffolk are being tried sorely by money from certain parties, whom I will hang if I catch playing their tricks in my quarters; by law of arms I will serve them. Order Isham to keep the bridge (it is needful), and shoot any one passing who has not a pass. Tell Captain Russell my mind on his men's drinking the poor man's ale, and not paying. I will not allow any plunder; so pay the man, and stop their pay to make it up. I will cashier officers and men if such is done in future." The second note, after the last quoted, addressed to "Mr. Squire, at his quarters, Chatteris: *Haste, haste,*" and dated, "Headquarters, Monday, daybreak,"—says, "Wildman has seen one who says you have news. Surely you are aware of our great need. Send or come to me by dinner." To the same at Downham (no date)—"I learn that one landed at the quay from Holland, who was let go, and is now gone on by way of Lynn. I hear he has a peaked beard, of a blue-black colour; of some twenty-five years old; I think, from my letter, a Spaniard. See to

him. He will needs cross the Wash; stop him, and bring him to me. I shall be at Bury, if not at Newmarket. Haste—ride on spur." Squire has endorsed: "Got the man at Tilney, after a tussle—two troopers hit, and he sore cut, even to loss of life. Got all."

When we turn from the Cromwell as manifested in these brief, clear, business-like notes to his officers, to the Cromwell making long harangues or theological discourses, we find it difficult to believe that the latter is the same man as the former. The effect of the utterances of the former Cromwell was to make the most efficient army that had ever appeared upon earth; the effect of the utterances of the latter Cromwell was to send some of his ablest officers or generals to sleep. Richard Baxter relates that, a little while after Cromwell's usurpation of the Protectorate, "Cromwell sent to speak with me, and when I came, in the presence of only three of his chief men, he began a long and tedious speech to me of God's providence in the change of the government, and how God had owned it, and what great things had been done at home and abroad, in the peace with Spain and Holland, &c. When he had wearied us all with speaking thus slowly about an hour, I told him I saw that what he learned must be from himself, being more disposed to speak many hours than to hear one, and little heeding what another said when he had spoken himself."[1] Lord Broghill, Lambert, and Thurloe were the individuals present on this occasion. Lambert fell asleep during Cromwell's speech.[2]

Though the portrait of Cromwell painted by Scott, in "Woodstock," is in many respects very untrue and unfair, yet Scott's conception of the character of Cromwell ap-

[1] Baxter's Life, part i. p. 205.

[2] Baxter's Penitent Confessions, p. 25. Orme's Life of Baxter, p. 145, note.

pears to me to be correct in one point. Scott describes Cromwell as engaged in a long theological controversy with the Presbyterian divine Nehemiah Holdenough, when he was suddenly interrupted, and at the same instant transformed from the long-winded preacher into the soldier and man of action. "Here an officer opened the door and looked in, to whom Cromwell, exchanging the canting drawl, in which it seemed he might have gone on interminably, for the short, quick tone of action, called out, 'Pearson, is he come?'" The style in which Scott has made Cromwell speak on this occasion is admirably characteristic.

We now approach the skirmish at Gainsborough, which was, according to Whitelocke, "the beginning of Cromwell's great fortunes," and was to show that the incessant labours indicated in the fragments of his correspondence just quoted were not thrown away, but that Cromwell had excellent military materials to work upon in the men of those Eastern counties. In a note dated "Wisbeach, this day"—Mr. Carlyle has put between inverted commas, "July, 1643"—and addressed "To Captain Montague or Sam Squire: Haste, haste, on spur," Cromwell writes: "Sir, One has just come in to say the Ca'ndishers have come as far as Thorney, and done a great mischief, and drove off some threescore fat beasts. Pray call in and follow them; they cannot have gone far. Give no quarter, as they shed blood at Bourne, and slew three poor men not in arms. So make haste.—From your friend and commander, Oliver Cromwell." In the same collection there is a letter dated 18th July 1643, from Henry Cromwell "To Captain Berry, at his quarters, Whittlesea: These in all haste," in which he says, "Sir, There is great news just come in by one of our men who has been home on

leave. The Ca'ndishers are coming on hot. Some say eighty troops, others fifty troops. Be it as it may, we must go on. Vermuyden has sent his son to say we had better push on three troops as scouts as far as Stamford, and hold Peterborough at all costs, as it is the key of the Fen, which, if lost, much ill may ensue. Our news says, Ca'ndish has sworn to sweep the Fens clear of us. How he handles his broom we will see when we meet; he may find else than dirt to try his hand on, I think. Our men being ready, we shall ride in and join your troop at dawn. Therefore send out scouts to see. Also good intelligencers on foot had better be seen after; they are best, I find, on all occasions. Hold the town secure; none go in or out, on pain of law of arms and war. Sharman is come in from Thrapstone: there was a troop of the King's men driving, but got cut down to a man, not far from Kettering, by the Bedford horse, and no quarter given, I hear. Sir, this is all the news I have. My father desires me to say, Pray be careful. Sir, I rest your humble servant, Henry Cromwell."

Ten days after the date of this last letter, on Friday, the 28th of July 1643, the forces of General Cavendish were completely routed by Cromwell at Gainsborough, and Cavendish himself slain.

The Royalists, who not only committed innumerable cruelties in the attempt to reduce England, Scotland, and Ireland to a state of slavery, but actually incorporated with their own forces many of the perpetrators of the abominable cruelties of the Irish massacre, charged Cromwell's troops with cruelty: "for it was such a sort of men," says Sir Philip Warwick,[1] "as killed brave young Cavendish and many others in cold blood."

[1] Memoirs of the Reign of King Charles I., p. 252. Second edition. London 1702.

Now the facts are these: Cavendish and others were, after a furious charge up-hill by Cromwell's twelve troops of horse and dragoons,—though Cavendish's forces were more than thrice that number,—driven into a bog and there killed.[1] If it be objected that Cromwell's men ought to have made them prisoners instead of killing them, it is to be borne in mind that Cavendish and his troops, a division of Newcastle's "Papist" army, had given great provocation to Cromwell and his men by the depredations, the outrages, and the cruelty of which they had been guilty, slaying men not in arms, driving off cattle,—in the words of a letter of Oliver Cromwell himself already quoted, "tearing and robbing all, poor and rich." On the other hand, Cromwell himself never allowed any to be robbed, but paid for everything justly to friend and foe alike. The character, as well as the superiority in numbers of their enemies, may have excited Cromwell's soldiers on this occasion, as at the storm of Drogheda, to give no quarter. Cromwell, with twelve troops of horse and dragoons, having marched to the relief of Gainsborough, found the enemy, more than thrice his number, drawn up near the town, and no way to attack them but through a gate and up-hill. Notwithstanding these disadvantages, he fell upon them, and after some dispute, totally routed them, killing many of their officers, and amongst them Lieutenant-General Cavendish. Gainsborough was thus relieved.[2]

In the summer of 1643 the Parliament ordered an additional levy of 2000 men to be placed under Cromwell's command, on which occasion a journal of the time thus describes his peculiar discipline: "As for Colonel Cromwell, he hath 2000 more brave men, well disciplined. No

[1] Perfect Diurnal. Forster's Life of Cromwell, i. 103.

[2] Ludlow's Memoirs, i. 67, 68. Second edition. London, 1721.

man swears but he pays his twelve pence; if he be drunk, he is set in the stocks, or worse; if one calls the other Roundhead, he is cashiered: insomuch that the countries where they come leap for joy of them, and come in and join with them. How happy were it if all the forces were thus disciplined."[1] Baillie gives a remarkable confirmation of the discipline of Cromwell's troops. "Cromwell," he says, "took such a course with his soldiers that they did less displeasure at Glasgow nor if they had been at London, though Mr. Zacharie Boyd railled on them all to their very faces in the High Church."[2]

These were times, however, when Cromwell's soldiers were very little inclined to mercy, as in the storm of Drogheda, and in the heat of fight generally. But then they were in their own opinion and that of their general "doing execution upon the Lord's enemies." After one of his early skirmishes, Cromwell thus writes to the Speaker: "God hath given us this evening a glorious victory over our enemies. They were, as we are informed, one-and-twenty colours of horse troops, and three or four of dragoons. It was late in the evening when we drew out. They came and faced us within two miles of the town. So soon as we had the alarm we drew out our forces, consisting of about twelve troops, whereof some of them so poor and broken, that you shall seldom have seen worse. With this handful it pleased God to cast the scale; for after we had stood a little above musket-shot, the one body from the other, and the dragoons having fired on both sides for the space of half-an-hour or more, they not advancing towards us, we agreed to charge them, and,

[1] Special Passages, May 9–16, 1643, in "Cromwelliana," p. 5.

[2] Memoirs of the Life of Robert Baillie, p. 63. Published in Mr. Laing's edition of Baillie's Letters and Journals.

advancing the body, after many shots on both sides, came with our troops a pretty round trot, they standing firm to receive us, and our men charging fiercely upon them, they were immediately routed and ran all away, and we had the execution of them two or three miles. I believe some of our soldiers did kill two or three men apiece. We have also gotten some of their officers and some of their colours; but what the number of dead is, or what the prisoners, for the present we have not time to inquire into."[1] And after the battle of Marston Moor, a nephew of Cromwell's, who was mortally wounded, said one thing lay upon his spirit. Cromwell having asked him what that was, he replied that "it was that God had not suffered him to be no more the executioner of His enemies."[2]

The proceeding described in the following curious passage of Hugh Peters's account to the Parliament of the taking of Basing House may be classed somewhere between the extreme abstinence from plunder first mentioned, and the unrelenting "execution of the Lord's enemies" last described. "Eight or nine gentlewomen of rank, coming out together, were entertained by the common soldiers somewhat coarsely, yet not uncivilly; they left them with some clothes upon them."[3]

Such was the effect of the small body of troops led by Cromwell, full of enthusiasm for the cause for which they

[1] Perfect Diurnal, 25th May 1643, in "Cromwelliana," p. 5.

[2] Letter of Oliver Cromwell, July 5, 1644. Forster's Life of Cromwell, i. 139.

[3] In copying this passage some years ago from one of the King's pamphlets in the British Museum, I find that I have unfortunately omitted the reference. In Hugh Peters's Relation to the House of Commons of the taking of Basing House in Sprigge's "Anglia Rediviva," pp. 139–141, the passage differs in a few words from that above quoted—"Eight or nine gentlewomen of rank, running forth together, were entertained by the common soldiers somewhat coarsely, yet not uncivilly, considering the action in hand."

fought, admirably disciplined and admirably officered, that even that disastrous campaign of 1643 closed with some gleams of hope for the cause of the Parliament. In addition to what he had already done, Cromwell gained, on the 12th of October, a decided victory over a force more than twice as numerous as his own. He had been joined with the Earl of Manchester—formerly known as Lord Kimbolton, but now become Earl of Manchester by his father's death—in the command of the six associated counties, Norfolk, Suffolk, Essex, Cambridge, Huntingdon, and Bedford.[1] Manchester, with upwards of 7000 foot, had marched from London to join Cromwell in Lincolnshire, where Sir Thomas Fairfax, with his horse, had already joined him. Sir John Henderson, an old soldier, sent forward by the Earl of Newcastle with a strong detachment of horse and dragoons, "appearing by their standards to be 87 troops,"[2] came up with Fairfax, Cromwell, and their cavalry, "37 troops of horse and dragoons,"[3] at Waisby or Winsby-field, near Horncastle, while Manchester with the foot was a day's march in the rear, and made haste to charge them before Manchester with the foot could come up. The encounter was very sharp but short, for the fight lasted but a quarter of an hour before the Earl of Newcastle's forces were totally routed and many killed, amongst them the Lord Widdrington, Sir Ingram Hopton, and other persons of quality.[4] In the first shock, Cromwell's horse, having been struck with a shot, fell; and as Cromwell rose from the ground he was again struck down. For some minutes

[1] Lincoln was afterwards added to the association, which addition would make seven associated counties.

[2] Ludlow's Memoirs, i. 69. Second edition. London, 1721.

[3] Ludlow, ibid.

[4] Ludlow, ibid.

he lay insensible, but again recovering, he seized a "sorry horse" from one of his troopers and joined the fight. "There were slain in the pursuit (which was full six miles) about 600, and many drowned in the chase; 114 were found dead in the water and mires the next day; there were also about 700 or 800 taken prisoners, and 18 colours at the least; there were brought in the first night, also, their waggons; many more colours, it is like, were lost in the chase; the horse and arms that were taken were more than the men doubled."[1]

On the 22d January 164$\frac{3}{4}$, the House of Commons, on a motion by Cromwell, "that the Earl of Manchester might be made Serjeant-Major-General of the county of Lincoln, as well as of the other associated counties," voted that "the Lord-General be desired to grant a commission to the Earl of Manchester, according to the ordinance of both Houses, for the seven associated counties, to be Major-General of the county of Lincoln, and to command all the forces there, as well as the six associated counties."[2] The Earl of Manchester, in the following month of February, is reported in one of the contemporary newspapers to have appointed Colonel Cromwell to be his lieutenant-general.[3]

The military operations continued all through the winter, without regard to the inclemencies of the season. This course would seem from the first to have been adopted by both sides. Thus the Royalist forces having made an attempt on Nottingham on the 15th of January 164$\frac{3}{4}$, Mrs.

[1] "The Scottish Dove," October 13–20, 1643, in "Cromwelliana," p. 7.

[2] D'Ewes's Journal, Harl. MSS., cited in Sanford's "Studies and Illustrations of the Great Rebellion," pp. 580, 581. The seven associated counties were, therefore, now Norfolk, Suffolk, Essex, Bedford, Cambridge, Huntingdon, Lincoln.

[3] Ibid., p. 581.

Hutchinson describes the result of it in terms which convey a forcible impression of the hardships the troops underwent at that season. "For two miles the enemy's horse left a great track of blood, which froze as it fell upon the snow, for it was such bitter weather that the foot had waded almost to the middle in snow as they came, and were so numbed with cold when they came into the town, that they were fain to be rubbed to get life into them, and, in that condition, were more eager of fires and warm meat than of plunder."[1]

The King having concluded a suspension of arms[2] with the Irish insurgents, which was signed on the 15th of September 1643, the Earl of Ormond, who commanded for Charles in Ireland, immediately prepared to send some of the English regiments which had been employed in Ireland to the assistance of the King in England. Ormond selected for this purpose those regiments of which he thought himself most secure. On their arrival in England, these troops were employed in the siege of Nantwich, under the command of Lord Byron, lately Sir John Byron. Sir Thomas Fairfax, marching from Lincolnshire in the depth of this severe winter, surprised Lord Byron by the extraordinary rapidity of his march, and defeated him at Nantwich, on the 25th of January 164$\frac{3}{4}$. Fairfax then marched back to

[1] Memoirs of Colonel Hutchinson, pp. 206, 207. Bohn's edition, 1854.

[2] It was one of the articles of peace between the Earl of Ormond and the Irish, that the two Irish Acts of Charles I., prohibiting the Irish from ploughing with horses by the tail, and burning oats in the straw, should be immediately repealed.—Barrington on the Statutes, p. 162, note. 4to. London, 1796. Burt, writing about 1725, says, "In the Western Highlands they still retain that barbarous custom (which I have not seen anywhere else) of drawing the harrow by the horse's dock, without any manner of harness whatever. And when the tail becomes too short for the purpose, they lengthen it with twisted sticks. This practice was formerly forbidden in Ireland by Act of Parliament."—Letters from the North of Scotland, ii. 125. New edition. London, 1815.

Yorkshire, and, joining his father, Lord Fairfax, defeated at Selby, Colonel Bellasis, the Royalist governor of York. He then prepared to march to the relief of the army of the Scots, which, under the command of Alexander Leslie, now Earl of Leven, was harassed by the weather, by the want of provisions and forage, and by the Royalist troops under the Marquis of Newcastle. The victory which the united forces of Sir Thomas Fairfax and his father, Lord Fairfax, gained at Selby, tended to relieve the Scottish general from his difficult position. It created a panic at York, which caused the Marquis of Newcastle to fall back on that city. The Fairfaxes and Leven joined their forces at Wetherby on the 20th of April, and proceeded to invest York, into which Newcastle with his troops had retired. Manchester and Cromwell joined their forces to those of the besiegers. In the meantime Prince Rupert had relieved Newark and Lathom House, where the Countess of Derby had made a gallant defence; had taken Bolton, where he refused quarter,[1] and put 1200 to the sword; and Liverpool, the inhabitants of which also suffered severely from his licentious troops.

[1] Rushworth, v. 623, *et seq.* The Parliament passed an ordinance (Rush., v. 783) against giving the Irish quarter, since the Irish pursued the same mode of warfare to which they had been accustomed in their rebellion. Hume says that Prince Rupert, by making some reprisals, soon repressed the inhumanity. But Rupert's refusal of quarter had occurred some months previously to the Parliament's ordinance. Cromwell might have defended his order to give no quarter at the storm of Drogheda and Wexford, by citing this ordinance of the Parliament.

## CHAPTER XIV.

*THE BATTLE OF MARSTON MOOR.*

ON the 14th of June, King Charles wrote a letter to his nephew, Prince Rupert, commanding him to march immediately with all his forces to the relief of York. "But," the letter continued, "if that be either lost or have freed themselves from the besiegers, or that for want of powder you cannot undertake that work, that you immediately march, with your whole strength, directly to Worcester, to assist me and my army, without which, or your having relieved York by beating the Scots, all the successes you can afterwards have, most infallibly will be useless unto me."[1] Rupert on receiving this letter at once marched for York, taking with him some newly-arrived Irish[2] regiments, and being joined by Newcastle's cavalry on his route.

A study, continued through many years, of all the trustworthy authorities I have been able to meet with relating to the battle of Marston Moor, assisted latterly by more

[1] Mr. Forster has printed this letter from the original among papers intrusted to him by Lord Nugent.—Life of Cromwell, i. 129, 130. London, 1830. Mr. Forster thinks that this letter completely vindicates Rupert in the course he adopted on receiving it, though it does not excuse his concealing the fact of his having received such a letter. This letter, in a slightly incorrect state, had been printed before in the Appendix to Evelyn's Memoirs from some copy taken at the time and preserved among Sir Edward Nicholas's manuscripts.

[2] English regiments which had been employed in Ireland; for though in the atrocities committed afterwards under Montrose in Scotland, particularly at Aberdeen, the native Irish were the chief actors, the Royalist troops at Marston Moor were all English except a few troops of Irish under Rupert.

authorities brought forward by the persevering researches of Mr. Sanford, whose very valuable volume on the Great Rebellion I had not seen till recently, has led me to form a much higher opinion of Prince Rupert's abilities than I had before entertained. Too great impetuosity, unless as in the case of Napoleon Bonaparte, accompanied by extraordinary genius, is a dangerous quality in a general. And Rupert had probably too great impetuosity. But whatever military talent he may have displayed on other occasions in that war, which on the whole brought out but a small amount of military talent of a high order, the only strategic ability shown at Marston Moor was shown by Rupert; and even if Rupert should be pronounced a positively bad general, and Leven, Fairfax, and Manchester positively good ones, the result seems to confirm the truth of the saying attributed to Napoleon that one bad general is better than two good ones. The battle, as far as the generalship of the three Parliamentary generals was concerned, would have been lost by the Parliament but for the genius of Oliver Cromwell; not strategic genius, for he held only a subordinate command, but the genius shown in the wonderful perfection to which he had brought his military materials, "his instruments," as he himself called them. I have shown, or at least attempted to show, in my account[1] of the battle of Dunbar, for which I claim the same credit I give to Mr. Sanford for his account of the battle of Marston Moor, that Cromwell never "exhibited that higher military genius which dazzles and excites, if it does not elevate, the mind of the reader in studying the campaigns of Hannibal and Frederic; and

[1] History of the Commonwealth of England, from the death of Charles I. to the expulsion of the Long Parliament by Cromwell, i. 351–377. London: John Murray, Albemarle Street, 1864.

relieves the attention, sick and weary with looking at a country turned into a huge slaughter-house, by presenting to it not the mere action of matter upon matter, but the action of mind producing combinations so new, so astonishing, and so powerful, that the effect is like that of some of the great powers of Nature, and an army is destroyed as if by a stroke of lightning."[1] But Cromwell's genius might, if not a strategic, be termed a creative genius; for he saw what no one else saw, that the side he belonged to in this war contained military materials of the very highest value. And while the stimulants applied to the men who called themselves Cavaliers were mostly alcoholic, and the discipline loose, Cromwell, while he subjected the men who filled his ranks to a discipline "more rigid than had ever before been known in England, administered," to borrow the apt words of Macaulay, "to their intellectual and moral nature stimulants of fearful potency."

On Monday, the 1st of July, intelligence reached the generals of the Parliamentary army engaged in the siege of York that Prince Rupert with a numerous army was marching from Knaresborough upon York. Upon receiving this intelligence the Parliamentary generals drew off all their forces from before the city of York, and, marching westward, concentrated them on a level tract of unenclosed and uncultivated ground, situated on the south side of the Ouse, stretching from the river Ouse southwards, and called in its various parts Monkton Moor, Tockwith Moor, Hessay Moor, and Marston Moor—the last taking its name from the village of Long-Marston, which borders it on the south. This village of Long-Marston, with its

[1] History of the Commonwealth of England, from the death of Charles I. to the expulsion of the Long Parliament by Cromwell, i. 352. London: John Murray, Albemarle Street, 1864.

thatched roofs rising to such a height above the walls as to seem to have the proportion of nearly two to one to the latter, would seem to be little changed since the battle—a proof of which is afforded by the information I received there in 1861 that several small cannon-balls had been recently found embedded in the thick thatch of some of the old cottages. It may be remarked that those tracts of ground which in the South of England are called heaths are in the North of England and in Scotland called moors. On this moor, the soil of which is a heavy clay, well adapted for the growth of oak, was to be fought, in the evening of the 2d day of July 1644, the greatest battle as regarded numbers, and perhaps the most decisive battle as regarded results, throughout this civil war; for though Naseby was, in some respects, more decisive, Marston Moor was the turning point of the war. At Marston Moor the numbers were nearly equal on the two sides, being about 25,000 on each side. So that on this occasion about 50,000 British men were led to mutual slaughter.

In the afternoon of that same Monday, the 1st of July, the army of the Parliament was drawn up in order of battle, and "the soldiers," says Mr. Simeon Ashe, chaplain to the Earl of Manchester, "were again full of joy, expecting to have a battle with the enemy, being assured by their scouts that the Prince, with all his forces, would pass towards York that way." But Rupert defeated their plan of forcing him to an engagement before his junction with Newcastle, by throwing out a party of his horse to face them on the moor, having a bridge in their rear to secure their retreat, while he marched to Boroughbridge, and crossed the Ouse at Thornton Bridge. Rupert then marching on the north bank of the Ouse, seized a bridge of boats, which Manchester had ordered to be constructed

at Poppleton, and had left a regiment of dragoons to guard, intending to pass his army over it, in case the Royalists should march towards the city by the north side of the river. The Parliamentary generals had made another bridge on the west side of the city, so weak that they durst not venture their troops upon it, and were, therefore, unable to prevent the junction of Rupert's and Newcastle's forces. Rupert having quartered his foot and ordnance about five miles from York, approached the city himself with 2000 horse.

The night drawing on, the foot-soldiers of the Parliamentary army marched into the village of Long-Marston, about seven miles from York, "where very few had the comfort of either convenient lodging or food. The soldiers drank the wells dry, and then were obliged to make use of puddle-water; most of the horse quartered on the moor, and the generals and field-officers met in earnest debate."[1] The English were for fighting, the Scots for retreating. The latter opinion prevailed, and early next morning, the 2d of July, the march began. The Scots were in the van; then came the English foot and all the artillery; Sir Thomas Fairfax, Cromwell, and David Leslie brought up the rear with 3000 horse and dragoons. A party of the Royalists' horse again faced them, and then wheeled round out of sight. The Parliamentary generals conjectured that Rupert was attempting to engage their attention, while with the main body of his forces he marched southwards. They therefore resolved to march five or six miles southwards, towards Tadcaster. But they had again mistaken the intentions of Rupert; for after the reconnaissance

[1] Sanford, Great Rebellion, p. 590. "I have given," says Mr. Sanford, "the description of the operations as much as possible in the words of the original authorities."—P. 589, note.

made by the party of horse, the Prince, at about nine o'clock in the morning, drew over a great part of his troops by the bridge which he had seized the night before, and by a ford near it, and with about 5000 horse and dragoons, entered on the moor near the village of Long-Marston, and came close up to the rear of his enemy's carriages. The Scots were already within a mile of Tadcaster, and the Earl of Manchester's foot were two or three miles beyond Long-Marston, when there came a very urgent message from Sir Thomas Fairfax that they must hasten back with all the speed they possibly could make; for the Prince's army, horse and foot, were upon their rear; that he hoped, however, by the advantage of the ground he was on, to make it good till they came back. The Parliamentary foot instantly began to return, but before they could get back, Rupert's army had come up in such numbers as to obtain the entire possession of the moor. As the Parliamentary forces came up, they were formed in order of battle along the south side of the moor, on the rising ground covered with fields of grain, called "Marston Fields." Here, to compensate the inconvenience arising from the height of the corn, the Parliamentary troops had the advantage of the sun and wind, and of being on the higher ground.

The right wing of the Parliamentary army, consisting of Lord Fairfax's forces, was posted close to the village of Long-Marston. The extremity of the right wing was composed of about 5000 cavalry, drawn up in eighty troops, and commanded by Sir Thomas Fairfax. The centre was composed of the Earl of Leven's Scotch foot, and a brigade of the Earl of Manchester's English foot. On the left wing, the extremity of which extended to Tockwith, a village to the north-west of Long-Marston,

was drawn up the Earl of Manchester's army from the associated counties, under the general command of Lieutenant-General Cromwell, consisting of three brigades of foot under the command of Laurence Crawford, who was Manchester's major-general, as Cromwell was his lieutenant-general, and who, differing from Cromwell, both as to the relative merits of Cromwell and himself, and of Cromwell's religion and his religion, attempted to maintain his ground against Cromwell by a slanderous charge of cowardice. To the left of these brigades of foot about 5000 horse were drawn up in five bodies, and seventy troops, under Cromwell's immediate command, consisting of Manchester's, or, we should rather say, Cromwell's cavalry, backed by three regiments[1] of Scotch horse, under Major-General David Leslie. "Beyond these, on the extreme left, and close upon Tockwith, were Colonel Frizeall and the dragoons, with whom was Colonel Skeldon Crawford."[2]

Of the Royal army, which extended along the moor for some two miles, Rupert's forces formed on the right, and Newcastle's on the left. The right was under the command of Rupert[3] himself, who was thus immediately opposed to Cromwell, and consisted of about 5000 picked

[1] Mr. Sanford, whose accuracy is in general most trustworthy, says "troops" in his narrative (Great Rebellion, p. 597), and "regiments" in his plan of the battle (facing p. 595). I think it impossible that David Leslie could have done as much as even Cromwell's letter grudgingly allows, if he had only had three troops, and not three regiments.

[2] Sanford, Great Rebellion, p. 597.

[3] The device of placing Rupert on this occasion on the left wing of his army, which is adopted by Scott and other writers of romance, originated, I believe, with that false statement, among others, appearing in a work bearing the respectable name of Whitelocke. I believe Whitelocke left behind him such a work in MS., and that parts of the work called Whitelocke's Memorials were written by him; but I have not the smallest doubt that he did not write the account of the battle of Marston Moor published under his name, and which

horse, drawn up in twelve divisions, containing 100 troops; and having among them the Newark horse and Irish Catholics, under Lord Byron, and Rupert's own brigade of cavalry, including his troop of Life Guards, who formed the van in every charge. Of the centre, composed of foot, the most notable body was Newcastle's brigade of his own tenantry, styled "Whitecoats." The left consisted of 4000 horse (with reserves), commanded by George Goring, general of Newcastle's cavalry, and under him, by his lieutenant-general, Sir Charles Lucas, and Sir John Hurrey or Urry.

In the contemporary accounts of the battle, a ditch is[1] mentioned as lying between the two armies, and placing the side making the first attack at some disadvantage. I have myself made a personal examination of the ground, and have compared my observations with those of others, particularly those of Mr. Sanford and Mr. Herman Merivale; but I have arrived at the conclusion, that in consequence of the subsequent drainage and enclosures, this ditch cannot now be identified. There is, indeed, or was, as late as May 1861, a ditch which at one time I thought might be the ditch in question. But I have now no faith

Scott cites *in extenso* in the notes to "Rokeby." It is quite impossible that a man who, like Whitelocke, knew intimately many officers who had been in the battle—Cromwell himself, among others,—could have made so many false statements.

[1] Mr. Sanford says: "A deep ditch and hedge ran along in front of the King's forces, and were lined with four brigades of their musketeers."—Studies of the Great Rebellion, p. 594. But although it is stated that on one side of the lane, called "Moor Lane," which will be described subsequently, there was a ditch, and on the other side of that lane a hedge, a hedge is not mentioned in connection with the ditch that ran along between the two armies. The words in one of the contemporary authorities are—"There was a great ditch between the enemy and us, which ran along the front of the battle; in this ditch the enemy had placed four brigades of their best foot, which, upon the advance of our battle, were forced to give ground."—Merc. Brit., 8th July 1644, in "Cromwelliana," p. 10.

in that opinion. On a ridge or rising ground at a considerable distance south-west from this ditch stands an old fir-tree, where, according to tradition, the Parliament's artillery was planted. There is a gap in a hedge, in which gap the country-people say quickset will not grow, and which tradition has named "Cromwell's gap."

Any one who has looked round from the top of York Minster is struck with the wide circuit of level ground, extending to a distance of about twenty miles on all sides. A country with so level a surface would be peculiarly favourable to the movements of cavalry. Prince Rupert had some ground for confidence in the strength and efficiency of his cavalry, and also, perhaps, he had some ground for confidence in his own efficiency as a cavalry officer. Probably, also, neither he nor any one else was at that time fully aware that there was in the army of the Parliament a better cavalry officer than himself; and that this officer commanded a body of troops equal to his in strength and courage, in arms, offensive and defensive, in horses and the management of them; and superior in discipline. Rupert's opinion for fighting a battle immediately would appear to have had, at least, as much weight as the opposite opinion against fighting.

Behind the ditch above mentioned, which covered a great part of their front from the charge of cavalry, the Parliamentary army, with their backs to the village of Long-Marston, and their faces to Wilstrop Wood, was posted. As Prince Rupert's forces came up, they formed on the other side of this ditch; and in this position the two armies faced each other with this broad and deep ditch between them. About three o'clock in the afternoon a cannonade was commenced on both sides, with small effect; for battles were not decided at that time by artillery

or musketry, but by cavalry and pikemen. This cannonade continued for about two hours, when the Parliamentary army, says Slingsby, "fell to singing psalms." The effect at such a time of a verse or two of such a psalm as the 77th on those warlike enthusiasts would be far greater than the war-songs of the Greeks, or the speech of a Roman general before joining battle—when so many stern voices united in giving solemn utterance to the description of how "God brake the bow and arrows; the shield and the sword—God, who is of greater strength than the hills of the robbers;" or to the prayer in the 83d Psalm against them that oppress the people of God—a psalm which has been translated by Milton.

It now began to be thought there would be no battle that night. It was drawing near to seven o'clock, and within little more than an hour of sunset. The sun's slanting rays were gilding in the far distance the white towers of that "most august of temples, the noble Minster of York." They also brought out the characteristics of the two armies—displaying Newcastle's brigade of White-coats, the farmers who came out at the call of a popular landlord in their Sunday coats of a drab colour, brought from their homes to die here—for what?—illumining the inlaid armour, the glittering helmets, and waving plumes of Rupert's cavalry—illumining also the unornamented but strong steel caps and gleaming cuirasses of a large and compact body of cavalry commanded by Oliver Cromwell. As the two armies thus stood looking each other in the face, a reflection of one who was present, and who is only cited by Mr. Sanford[1] as an eye-witness, his name not being given, may have occurred to many—"We looked, and, no doubt, they also, upon this fight as the losing or

[1] Studies and Illustrations of the Great Rebellion, pp. 597, 598.

gaining the garland. And now the sword must determine that which a hundred years' policy and dispute could not do." This man, whoever he was, saw as clearly as Prince Bismarck that the great questions of the age were not to be solved by Parliamentary harangues and resolutions, but by blood and iron.

One of the main causes of the confusion that pervades almost all the accounts that have been given of the battle of Marston Moor is this: As the Royalists' horse of the left wing were victorious over the right wing of the Parliament; and the Parliament's horse of the left wing were victorious over the right wing of the Royalists' horse; and as Prince Rupert's cavalry charge had generally, if not universally, before this time been successful, it has been assumed that Rupert commanded in person on this occasion the successful wing of the Royalists' cavalry. Tradition from the first had selected this as one of the instances of the effect of Rupert's "fiery charge." And this tradition has been partly supported by some of the contemporary Royalists' accounts; for instance, that of Trevor, printed in Carte's Letters, who, however, contradicts himself, first saying, "the horse of Prince Rupert and Lord Byron were totally routed,"[1] and afterwards, in the same letter, as if to re-establish Prince Rupert's invincibility, "on the left[2] wing the enemy had the better of us, and on the right wing, where the Prince charged, we had infinitely the better of the enemy." The Royalists' horse on the Royalists' left wing, which would face the

[1] Carte's Letters, i. 56.

[2] Ibid., p. 57.—Trevor here takes advantage of the facility there is in *shuffling* between the opposite meanings of right and left according to the army or side to which the word is applied. Rushworth's account of the battle is unintelligible, and involved in inextricable confusion from his confusion about who commanded the right and left wings of the Royalists.

Parliamentary right wing, was commanded by Goring and Sir John Urry, the same Urry who had already changed sides once, afterwards changed sides twice more, and at last got hanged to prevent him from changing sides any more.

Poets and romance-writers, from Defoe in his "Memoirs of a Cavalier," to Sir Walter Scott in "Rokeby," and Eliot Warburton in his biography of Prince Rupert, have taken up the tradition and treated it as a matter of fact. Eliot Warburton endeavours to establish it on the authority of "Whitelocke and Fairfax." Whitelocke, or the person who drew up the account which is published under the name of Whitelocke,[1] knew so little about the matter that he says the battle was fought on the 3d instead of the 2d of July, and began at seven in the morning, instead of seven in the evening. Fairfax, in his modest Memorials, says nothing about it. He says "Lieutenant-General Cromwell commanded the left wing of the horse; I had the right wing."[2] But he does not say one word as to who commanded the right and left wing of the Royalist horse. Consequently, Mr. Eliot Warburton's two authorities for Rupert's commanding the Royalists' left wing are no authorities at all on that point. The fact is quite clear and well established that Rupert did not head in person the successful charge of the Royalists' horse under Goring and Urry on the left of the Royal and right of the Par-

[1] It is strange that Whitelocke, who was not a soldier, should be cited, and not Ludlow, who was a soldier and a clear-headed man, who, though not in the battle any more than Whitelocke, would, as a soldier, hear the facts from soldiers, and repeat them more accurately than those who rant about heroes, and write for effect without regard to truth. Ludlow says: "The left wing of our army, commanded by Colonel Cromwell, engaged the right wing of the enemy commanded by Prince Rupert."—Ludlow's Memoirs, i. 124, second edition. London, 1721.

[2] Fairfax's Memorials. Somers's Tracts, v. 389, 390. Walter Scott's edition.

liamentary army. Watson, Cromwell's scoutmaster, who was in the battle, distinctly affirms that Rupert rode at the head of his own Life Guards, on the west of the field, where Cromwell's cavalry were.

From the first outbreak of the war two years before, to the 2d of July 1644, a long series of successful encounters had given to Prince Rupert an amount of confidence so great that he did not consider it within the bounds of probability that he should meet with any troops on the side of the Parliament able to stand his onset. This confidence, amounting to arrogance, is strikingly exemplified in an anecdote given by Mr. Sanford. Prince Rupert having asked a prisoner who were the leaders of the Parliamentary army, the man answered, "General Leven, my Lord Fairfax, and Sir Thomas Fairfax."—"Is Cromwell there?" exclaimed Rupert, interrupting him,—for the skirmish at Gainsborough had stamped the name of Cromwell on Rupert's memory. Being answered that he was, "Will they fight?" said Rupert; "if they will, they shall have fighting enough!" The soldier was then released, and returning to his own army, told the generals what had passed, and Cromwell that the Prince had asked for him in particular, and said they should have fighting enough. "And," exclaimed Cromwell, "if it please God, so shall he!"[1] It is also stated in contemporary accounts of this battle that Prince Rupert designed the most valiant of his Popish party to encounter the wing commanded by Lieutenant-General Cromwell; and, "in particular, Prince Rupert had designed certain troops of horse, all Irish and all Papists, to give the first charge to that brigade in which Cromwell was; and that they did confidently believe that there was not a man of them but would die rather than

[1] Sanford's Studies and Illustrations of the Great Rebellion, p. 598.

fly; but they missed their expectations, for many of them being slain in the place, the rest fled." [1]

The word of the Royalists was "God and the King;" that of the Parliament, "God with us." The equivalent of these words was afterwards embroidered on the colours of the Parliament and of Cromwell. Captain Burt, an English officer of Engineers quartered at Inverness between 1720 and 1730, was informed by a very ancient laird that "Oliver's colours were so strongly impressed on his memory, that he thought he saw them spread out by the wind with the word Emmanuel (God with us) upon them, in very large golden characters." [2]

Rupert having erected a battery opposite to the left wing of the Parliamentary forces, Cromwell ordered two field-pieces to be brought forward. Two regiments of foot being ordered to guard these, and, marching to that purpose, were fired upon from the ditch[3] by the musketeers of the Royalists' right wing. This at once brought on a general engagement at about half-past seven in the evening. The left of the Parliament's army moved down the hill, "Cromwell with his horse," says Slingsby, "coming off the coney-warren by Bilton-bream." Lord Byron's impetuosity lessened to his opponents the difficulty of the ditch. Dashing over the ditch, he threw his men into some disorder, and was immediately driven back. "In a moment," says Scoutmaster Watson, who was with Cromwell's horse, and who here gives the only intelligible account of the commencement of the battle of Marston Moor that I have ever seen, "we were passed the ditch on to the Moor, upon equal terms with the enemy, our men going

[1] Parl. Scout, 18th July 1644, in "Cromwelliana."
[2] Letters from the North of Scotland, i. 217. New edition. London, 1815.
[3] Ludlow's Memoirs, i. 124. Second edition. London, 1721.

in a running march. Our front divisions of horse charged their front, Cromwell's own division of 300 horse, in which himself was in person, charging the first division of Prince Rupert's, in which himself was in person, and in which were all their gallant men, they being resolved, if they could scatter Cromwell, all were their own. The rest of our horse," he continues, "backed by Leslie's three troops, charged other divisions of theirs, and with such admirable valour, as to astonish all the old soldiers of the army. Cromwell's own division had a hard struggle, for they were charged by Rupert's men both in front and flank." It is evident that some of Rupert's best troops, including his Life Guards, as already mentioned, had been posted opposite to Cromwell's brigade of cavalry; for, according to the testimony of contemporary military men of experience, the dispute at this point was particularly obstinate. "The horse on both sides," said General Ludlow, "behaved themselves with the utmost bravery; for, having discharged their pistols, and flung them at each other's heads, they fell to it with their swords."[1] Cromwell received a slight wound from a shot grazing his neck, which caused some alarm to his men, but exclaiming, "A miss is as good as a mile!" he pressed onwards. "For a while they stood at the sword's point, hacking one another; but at last Cromwell broke through, scattering them before him like a little dust." And the whole of Prince Rupert's horse on their right wing being broken, "they fly, says Slingsby, "along by Wilstrop Wood side as fast and as thick as could be." Watson says, "Manchester's foot charged by our side, dispersing the enemy's foot almost as fast as they charged them, still going by our side; so that we carried the whole field before us, thinking the victory

[1] Ludlow's Memoirs, i. 124. Second edition. London, 1721.

ours, and nothing to be done but to kill and take prisoners."[1]

Many causes combined to render the conflict between Cromwell's cavalry and Rupert's unusually desperate. Rupert's cavalry, above all his Life Guards, professed to entertain a profound contempt for all the Parliamentary troops, particularly for the Parliamentary cavalry, and, in addition to their demonstration of contempt, they hated them as rebels to their King, which King they, on the other hand, extolled as a god upon earth. The feelings of the Parliamentary troops on the other side, particularly of that portion of them which composed Cromwell's especial cavalry regiments, who, like Rupert's Life Guards, were picked men also, men selected, however, for two distinct qualities, their valour and their religious enthusiasm, were exasperated to the highest degree of hatred against the cavalry of Rupert, partly on account of their cruelty and profligacy, exhibited on many occasions in deeds for which blood only could atone; partly on account of the tyranny, civil and religious, which they made it their boast to fight for. The hostile feelings of the Parliamentary cavalry on that wing were further exasperated by the fact that the wing opposed to them, besides Rupert's Life Guards and Byron's Horse, contained a body of Irish horse, some of whom might probably have been concerned in the massacre of English Protestants in Ireland some three years before. There was, therefore, little wonder that the hate of those two bodies of cavalry should be dire as that of the most deadly enemies that ever brought their quarrel

[1] I have taken the passages of Watson's report from Mr. Sanford (pp. 599, 600), who does not give his references at the foot of each page, but gives a list of his chief authorities at p. 615, where he says: "The various letters and accounts of eye-witnesses in the newspapers and among the King's pamphlets in the British Museum; D'Ewes's Journal, from one of Watson's letters."

to the arbitrament of the sword; "dire as the hate at old Harlaw, that Scot to Scot did carry;" and, consequently, it was expected that the encounter between them would be fierce and bloody.

And the encounter was indeed fierce and bloody. The Royalists, who had hitherto, with Rupert at their head, ridden to victory and slaughter, now found to their surprise, and somewhat to their consternation, that they had quite another sort of enemy to deal with than they had before encountered. For they had, indeed, to deal with men "to whom the dust of the most desperate battle was like the breath of life;" men led by such a commander as Cromwell, and under such officers as Berry and Harrison —Harrison, to whom such a fight as this gave as much wild delight as if it had been the great battle of Armageddon itself, at which he believed he was destined to ride as one of the captains of Him on the White Horse, conquering and to conquer, when the voice of the angel standing in the sun shall call all the fowls that fly in the midst of heaven to feed on the flesh of kings, and the flesh of captains, and the flesh of mighty men.

Even in the ordinary affairs of life Harrison is described by Baxter, who knew him well, as "of a sanguine complexion, naturally of such a vivacity, hilarity, and alacrity as another man hath when he hath drunken a cup too much." And in battle his spirits appeared to rise considerably above this their usual state of vivacity, so that if ever mortal man in his warlike enthusiasm might be said to resemble the war-horse in Job, it was Harrison. "He mocketh at fear, and is not affrighted; neither turneth he back from the sword. He saith among the trumpets, Ha! ha! and he smelleth the battle afar off, the thunder of the captains, and the shouting."

Now was seen the complete success of the care with which Cromwell had selected and disciplined his troops. Rupert's Life Guards, hitherto so successful as to fancy themselves invincible, began to give way, and soon to be driven furiously back. In a few minutes more all the Royalists' cavalry in that part of the field were in headlong flight, closely followed by the enemy they had despised, but whom they would never despise more. But Cromwell and his officers knew that their work was not yet done. They, therefore, by the perfection of their discipline, drew off their men from the pursuit, formed them again on the moor, and were ready for the work they had yet to do; for they knew that the battle was not yet won.[1] For it will be observed that the words, quoted above—"thinking the victory ours," are Watson's, not Cromwell's.

In the meantime Sir Thomas Fairfax, commanding the cavalry on the right wing of the Parliament's army, had great difficulties to contend with. These cannot be better described than in Sir Thomas Fairfax's own words. After saying that "the left wing first charged the enemy's right wing, which was performed for a while with much resolution on both sides, but the enemy at length was put to the worst,"

[1] Some idea may be formed of the slaughter in this encounter between Rupert's and Cromwell's cavalry, from the assertion of Lord Byron in one of his early poems, that four brothers of his family fell on this occasion—

> "On Marston, with Rupert, 'gainst traitors contending,
> Four brothers enrich'd with their blood the bleak field,"

which, though only a family tradition, may be true; for Mrs. Lucy Hutchinson, whose husband, Colonel Hutchinson, was a cousin-german of the Byrons, says: "Sir John Byron, afterwards Lord Byron, and all his brothers, bred up in arms, and valiant men in their own persons, were all passionately the King's."—Memoirs of Colonel Hutchinson, p. 117. Bohn's edition. London, 1854. But if four of these brothers fell at Marston Moor, there must have been six brothers at least; for Sir John Byron, created Lord Byron in 1643, lived till 1652, when he was succeeded by Richard Byron, his brother and heir.

he thus proceeds: "Our right wing had not all so good success, by reason of the furzes and ditches we were to pass over before we could get to the enemy, which put us into great disorder."

I must here interrupt Fairfax's narrative to attempt to explain what he meant by the furzes and ditches which put his troops into great disorder. A plan of the ground might give the best explanation to those who study plans; but as "the general reader" does not study plans, I must attempt an explanation without one.[1] Besides the ditch before mentioned, which lay between the two armies, there was the road between the villages of Long-Marston and Tockwith, which ran nearly parallel with the ditch, and between the ditch and the Parliamentary army. Cromwell's left wing was posted near Tockwith, and had access to the ditch without the obstruction of furzes and hedges, while between Fairfax's right wing and the Royalists "there was no passage across the ditch, except at a narrow lane, where they could not march above three or four in front, and upon the one side of the lane was a ditch, and on the other, a hedge, both whereof were lined with musketeers."[2] This lane, still known as "Moor Lane," runs nearly at right angles to the road between Long-Marston and Tockwith, from which it branches off near Long-Marston, at about a fourth of the distance from Long-Marston to Tockwith, and leads to the moor. Some way down this lane, near a place where four lanes meet, a dyke,

[1] A very clear and accurate plan of the ground is given in a valuable paper on the battle by Mr. Herman Merivale, entitled, "A Visit to Marston Moor, May 1862," which appeared in *Macmillan's Magazine* for July 1862. Mr. Merivale says: "There are two or three ways turning off from the Tockwith road on the north, which might answer the description of the lane; but Sanford supposes, and I think with reason, that it was 'Moor Lane.'"

[2] Mere Brit., 8th July 1644.

called the "White Sykes," was cleared out and deepened about fifty years ago, when many old-fashioned horse-shoes, cannon-balls, the blade of a sword lying by the side of its hilt, and other relics of the battle, were dug up. Some time back, old peasants related that in their childhood they were afraid of venturing into Moor Lane by night for fear of encountering spectre horsemen; in consequence of the slaughter which had taken place on this spot—the bloodiest portion of a field which was the bloodiest in this war—if we except some of Montrose's battles, which, however, might be called massacres[1] rather than battles.

I now resume Fairfax's narrative: "Notwithstanding," he continues, "I drew up a body of 400 horse; but because their intervals of horse in this wing only were lined with musketeers, who did us much hurt with their shot, I was necessitated to charge them. We were a long time engaged, one within another,[2] but at last we routed that part

[1] Killed by Montrose, from September 1, 1644 to August 15, 1645:—

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | At Tippermuir, | 2000 |
| 2. | At Aberdeen, | 2000 |
| 3. | At Inverlochy, | 1500 |
| 4. | At Aulderne, | 3000 |
| 5. | At Alford, | 2000 |
| 6. | At Kilsyth, | 6000 |
| | | 16,500 |

On some of these occasions nearly the whole of the defeated army, particularly the foot, were killed. At Kilsyth, the army of the Covenanters was 6000 foot and 1000 horse. This account does not include the massacre of men not in arms, women and children, the numbers of whom, particularly at Aberdeen, must have been very great, as the slaughter continued for four days—a butchery and abomination not outdone by the demons in human form who were the executioners of Philip II. and the Duke of Alva in the Netherlands.

[2] "In the heat of the fight Fairfax was heard calling out to his officers and soldiers to be merciful to the common men, for they were seduced and knew not what they did; but to spare neither Irish nor buff-coats and feathers, for they were the instruments of their miseries."—Sanford, p. 601.

of their wing which we charged, and pursued them a good way towards York. Myself only returned presently to get to the men I left behind me. But that part of the enemy which stood, perceiving the disorder they were in, had charged and routed them before I could get to them; so that the good success we had at first was eclipsed by this bad conclusion. Our other wing, and most of the foot, went on prosperously, till they had cleared the field. I must ever remember, with thankfulness, the goodness of God to me this day; for having charged through the enemy, and my men going after the pursuit, and returning back to go to my other troops, I was got in among the enemy, who stood up and down the field in several bodies of horse. So taking the signal [a piece of white ribbon or paper] out of my hat, I passed through them for one of their own commanders, and got to my Lord of Manchester's horse in the other wing, only with a cut in my cheek, which was given me in the first charge, and a shot which my horse received. In this charge many of my officers and soldiers were hurt and slain."[1]

The state of things on the field was now this: The

[1] Fairfax's Memorials, Somers's Tracts, v. 389, 390 (Walter Scott's edition). Mr. Sanford (p. 602, note) gives a marginal note by Sir Thomas Fairfax on Fuller's account of the battle, at the part which relates the defeat of his wing by Goring, without naming him (Fairfax)—"I envy none that honour they deservedly got in this battle." He then tells the story pretty much as in the passage given above, and thus concludes—"But to show that some did their parts (having routed some of the enemy and taken Goring's major-general prisoner), few of us came off without dangerous wounds, and many mortal; which shows the left wing did not wholly leave the field, as the author of that book relates." The words at the beginning of this note, "I envy none," remind me of some words in the panegyric on Fairfax by his son-in-law, the Duke of Buckingham—

> "He never knew what envy was, nor hate;
> His soul was filled with truth and honesty,
> And with another thing quite out of date,
> Called modesty."

cavalry of the Royalists' left wing had routed the main part of the cavalry of the Parliamentary right wing (for though Fairfax, with a portion of that cavalry, had been successful, his success was of no avail), and also the foot of the Parliamentary centre, and had gone in pursuit of them. The cavalry of the Parliament's left wing had routed the cavalry of the Royalists' right wing, and had now to fight the foot of the Royalists' centre. The hardest part of this duty was with the Marquis of Newcastle's brigade of Whitecoats, who fought like hardy Northumbrian borderers, as they were. When "the thrice noble, illustrious, and excellent princess, Margaret, Duchess of Newcastle," as she styles herself, asserts that, having graciously descended from his coach-and-six, "my lord himself, in one encounter, killed three with his page's half-leaden sword, for he had no other left him," it is much to be regretted that the "illustrious princess" did not deign to inform the world where her thrice-valiant lord was when his brigade of borderers were so bravely but vainly opposing their serge doublets and unwieldy pikes to the repeated charge of Cromwell's cuirassiers; "fighting it out," says a contemporary writer, who cites as his authority one of Cromwell's troopers, afterwards a captain, "who was the third or fourth man that entered amongst them, till there was not thirty of them living."[1]

[1] The writer from whom these words are quoted can hardly be called a witness of the first order as to credibility, being a professional impostor, William Lilly, the astrologer, who says in his Life, written by himself—"Captain Camby, then a trooper under Cromwell, and an actor, who was the third or fourth man that entered amongst them, protested he never, in all the fights he was in, met with such resolute, brave fellows, or whom he pitied so much; and said he saved two or three against their wills." Sir Henry Slingsby, a better authority, says in his Memoirs, p. 50—"After our horse were gone, they fell upon our foot, and although a great while they maintained the fight, yet at last they were outdone, and most part either taken or killed."

By the time Cromwell's cavalry had done this work, Goring's and Urry's cavalry had returned from the pursuit of that part of the Parliamentary army which they had routed. Both the victorious wings now, therefore, found that another battle had to be fought for that victory which each thought it had already gained. The face of the battle was now almost exactly counter-changed, the Royalists' left wing now occupying nearly the same ground, with the same front, which the Parliamentary right wing had occupied; and the Parliament's left wing now occupying nearly the same ground, with the same front, which the Royalists' left wing had occupied at the beginning of the battle.

This last encounter was short, for while Cromwell's troopers came on in line, Goring's advanced in disorder. The consequence was that Goring's cavalry were soon in headlong flight, as Rupert's had been not long before; and the men who valued themselves on wearing their hair and parts of their dress in the fashion of King James' curl-pated minions or of loose women, and ventilating their vocabulary of scurrility upon the "round-headed dogs," the "crop-eared curs," this time found the jest rather a bitter one. Time has shown that the "crop-eared curs" were right both as to their hair and their dress.

Cromwell's cavalry had no cause to feel any compunction towards their routed enemy, who had so often refused quarter to the Parliamentary troops. The moonlight pursuit was bloody. "We followed them," says Cromwell's Scoutmaster Watson, "to within a mile of York, cutting them down, so that their dead bodies lay three miles in length."

If any additional evidence were necessary to prove that Prince Rupert was in the wing of the Royalists which was immediately opposed to Cromwell's brigade of horse,

it is afforded in the statement of Principal Baillie, then one of the Scots Commissioners in England. Baillie writes thus to his correspondent in Scotland: "There were three generals on each side, Leslie (Alexander Leslie, Earl of Leven), Fairfax (Ferdinando, Lord Fairfax, the father of Sir Thomas Fairfax), and Manchester; Rupert, Newcastle, and King (Newcastle's lieutenant-general, who did all his work for him). Within half an hour and less, all six took them to their heels."[1]

Now, if Rupert, as the romancers affirm, had commanded the wing of the Royalist cavalry which was victorious in the first encounter, he certainly could not have been said to have "taken to his heels within half an hour and less" after the battle began. He therefore must have been in the other wing, which was routed at once by the furious charge of Cromwell's cavalry.

Rupert afterwards had to fly with as much haste from the field of Naseby as he now fled from that of Marston Moor. But at Naseby he contrived to obtain a temporary success by not having the terrible brewer of Huntingdon at first opposed to him. After Naseby he did not venture upon much more brigandage[2] and cruelty[3] on the soil of

[1] Baillie's Letters and Journals, ii. 203, 204. 3 vols. Edinburgh, 1841. This would seem to be an error as regards Manchester. See Rushworth, v. 634. The author of the "Memoirs of the Somervilles," quoted by Scott in the notes to "Rokeby," says that the Earl of Leven never drew bridle until he came to Leeds; and that when, near twelve the next day, there arrived an express sent by David Leslie to acquaint the general they had obtained a most glorious victory, and that the Prince with his broken troops were fled from York, the general, upon the hearing of this, knocked upon his breast and said, "I would to God I had died on the place."

[2] Long before he fled from Naseby, Rupert had endeavoured to secure some part of his plunder—which, and the power to plunder the English nation afterwards, was all he fought for—by freighting one or two ships with it. But these fell into the hands of the Parliament.

[3] Mr. Herman Merivale, in the paper before quoted, on the authority of a Roundhead pamphlet entitled "A Dogg's Elegy, or Rupert's Teares," says that

England. But after he ceased to be a merciless robber by land, he became a pirate by sea, and with that strange luck which often attends such men, he contrived to escape the vengeance of Blake, as he had before escaped the vengeance of Cromwell.

This battle of Marston Moor was one of the battles which may be said to have been won by a charge of cavalry; and in that and in some other respects it bore some resemblance to Marengo. As Marston Moor was the turning-point of the war, it may be said to have been also the turning-point of Cromwell's fortunes. After Marston Moor those fortunes advanced with gigantic strides, even as Bonaparte's did after Marengo. But there was this difference between the two cases: The battle of Marengo was first lost by Bonaparte, and then won by the

the Roundheads discovered Rupert's favourite dog "Boy" among the slain—"more prized by his master than creatures of much more worth." It would seem that the poor dog had followed his master into the thick of the fight. It is something to secure the devoted attachment even of a dog. But I have not met with any other instance, on credible authority, of Rupert's having been, as Mr. Sanford says (p. 518), "generous in his disposition, and not insensible to better feelings." On the contrary, Clarendon, Pepys, and Admiral Penn all speak unfavourably of Rupert. Pepys says when he came to court after the Restoration, that he was "welcome to nobody." In a letter to Secretary Nicholas, dated "Paris, 27th February 1653-4," Hyde says, "You talk of money the King should have upon the prizes at Nantz. Alas! he hath not only not had one penny from thence, but Prince Rupert pretends the King owes him more money than ever I was worth; the man is a strange creature. I know nothing of his going into Holland." [There are then some asterisks in the printed letter, as if Hyde had said more against Rupert than those who edited the papers thought fit to print.]—Clarendon State Papers, iii. 320–322. According to the Rupert MSS. published by Mr. Eliot Warburton, the court of the exiled Prince Charles subsisted on Rupert's robberies by sea. This is denied by Clarendon, who is, at least, as trustworthy a witness as Rupert, and says: "Sure when it is known that Prince Rupert, instead of ever giving the King one penny of those millions which he had taken, demanded a great debt from the King; that he received £14,000 since his being in France, and took no more notice of it to the King than if he were not concerned, and that if he went away discontented, because the King would not approve of all he did, or desired to do, it cannot be wondered that the King did not importune him

arrival of Desaix's division and by Kellerman's cavalry charge. The man, therefore, who reaped all the benefit did really not win the battle. But the man whose cavalry charge won the battle at Marston Moor was also the man who reaped the benefit in the shape not only of fame and honour, but of power and its consequences—"for battles are great things—empires lie beyond them."

On the 24th of August 1572, just seventy-two years before this battle of Marston Moor, the families of Valois, Medici, and Guise, with whom the Stuarts were intimately connected by blood and disposition, had successfully performed at Paris the massacre of St. Bartholomew, which produced in the King of Spain excessive joy, reconcilement with the Court of France, and unbounded approval and admiration of its conduct. That massacre was, if possible, outdone by the Irish massacre in 1641. This battle, fought on the 2d day of July 1644, on Marston

to stay."—Ibid., 26th June 1654. Admiral Penn, in his Journal, relates several cases that place Rupert's tyranny and cruelty in a strong light. He says, under date 24th July 1651, that there came on board one of his ships "four of Rupert's men, who ventured their lives in attempting to escape from him at Toulon."—Granville Penn's Memorials of Admiral Sir William Penn, ii. 353. And three months later there occurs this entry: "30th October 1651.—About noon Captain Jordan came aboard, and informed me of a Genoese he stopped two nights since, who came from the island Terceira. . . . The lieutenant of the said ship, with others of the ship's company, gave us intelligence of Rupert's being, about six weeks since, at Terceira; and how cruelly he murdered the gunner of this ship, being an Englishman, and refusing to serve him. He commanded him from the town of Terceira aboard the *Reformation*, wherein he is admiral; and, having him aboard, commanded his ears to be cut off; which being done, he caused his arms to be bound together, and flung him overboard into the sea, where the poor creature perished."—Ibid., i. 380. Under date December 20, 1650, there is the following passage in Whitelocke (p. 485): "Letters that Prince Rupert came to Malaga and other ports, and fired and sunk divers English merchant ships, and demanded the master of a London ship, saying that he would boil him in pitch; but the governor of Malaga refused to deliver up the master to him." This is a strange sort of person to take for a hero, if possible worse than those sentimental ruffians of whom, to borrow the words of their creator, "I should not care to vaunt."

Moor, was the first great instalment of the payment of that debt of blood, of that terrible and bloody reckoning which was to teach kings a lesson to be remembered as long as this world shall last; and, therefore, this battle of Marston Moor has as good a title as most battles to be styled one of the decisive battles of the world.

Among the wounded at Marston Moor on the Parliament's side was the afterwards celebrated Algernon Sidney, who received several wounds, but none dangerous. Among those killed at Marston Moor on the side of the King was William Gascoygne of Middleton in Yorkshire, who, "it appears now to be generally admitted, was the original inventor of the wire micrometer, of its application to the telescope, and of the application of the telescope to the quadrant; but the invention was never promulgated, even in England, until the undoubtedly independent inventions of Auzout and Picard had suggested their publication."[1] Horrocks, a contemporary of Gascoygne, and who, like him, died young, at twenty-two or thereabouts, January 3, 1641 (old style), rendered also great service to the science of astronomy, being the first who remarked that the lunar motions might be represented by supposing an elliptic orbit, provided that the eccentricity of the ellipse were made to vary, and an oscillatory motion given to the line of apsides. Newton afterwards showed that both suppositions were consequences of the theory of gravitation, and attributes to Halley a part of what is really due to Horrocks.[2] If Horrocks and Gascoygne had lived out the ordinary age of man, there was reason to infer from what they had done so young, that they would have done some-

[1] Penny Cyclopedia, art. "Horrocks, Jeremiah," often spelled Horrox. This article was written, I believe, by the late Professor de Morgan.

[2] Ibid.

thing very considerable in science. If we compare what Falkland did for mankind with what Gascoygne did, and the blaze that has been thrown by Clarendon and other panegyrists upon the name of Falkland with the obscurity that rests on Gascoygne's nameless grave at Marston Moor, where he fell, we shall perceive a striking illustration of the thorough injustice with which the world so often distributes its fame and honours.[1]

All Rupert's artillery, ammunition, and baggage fell into the hands of the victors, together with 10,000 stand of arms and about 100 colours and standards; the Prince's own standard, with the arms of the Palatinate, being among them. There were 1500 prisoners taken by the Parliamentary forces, including many officers of rank. The loss on the King's side was three times that on the side of the Parliament. The countrymen who buried the bodies of the slain reported the number to be 4150. Of these, it was reckoned that nearly 3000 were of the Royal army, and that two-thirds of these were gentlemen. I have quoted at the bottom of this page, in reference to a young man of scientific promise, William Gascoygne, who fell at Marston Moor, a short note from Aubrey, which says of Gascoygne or Gasgoigne, "Mr. Towneley, of Towneley, in Lancashire, hath his papers." It would appear that a Mr. Towneley, of Towneley in Lancashire, also fell at Marston Moor, for in the lists of the officers killed on the King's side is "Master Towneley, of Towneley, a Lanca-

[1] Aubrey (Lives, ii. 355) gives this short notice of Gascoygne: "—— Gascoigne, Esq. of Middleton, near Leeds in Yorkshire, was killed at the battle of Marston Moor, about the age of twenty-four or twenty-five at most. Mr. Towneley of Towneley, in Lancashire, Esq. [*sic*], hath his papers. From Mr. Edw. Flamstead, who says he found out the way of improving telescopes before Des Cartes. Mr. Edw. Flamstead tells me, September 1682, that 'twas at York fight he was slain."

shire Papist." Connected with this death a family tradition has been handed down, for our knowledge of which, buried as it was, we are indebted to the indefatigable researches of Mr. Sanford, and which throws a momentary gleam of strange melancholy interest over that carnage-strewed moor. "Mary, daughter of Sir Francis Trappes, married Charles Towneley, of Towneley, in Lancashire, Esquire, who was killed at the battle of Marston Moor. During the engagement she was with her father at Knaresborough, where she heard of her husband's fate, and came upon the field the next morning in order to search for his body, while the attendants of the camp were stripping and burying the dead. Here she was accosted by a general officer, to whom she told her melancholy story. He heard her with great tenderness, but earnestly desired her to leave a place where, besides the distress of witnessing such a scene, she might probably be insulted. She complied, and he called a trooper, who took her *en croupe*. On her way to Knaresborough she inquired of the man the name of the officer to whose civility she had been indebted, and learned that it was Lieutenant-General Cromwell." [1]

From the battle of Marston Moor may be dated the first blazing up of the great quarrel between the Presbyterians and the Independents—a quarrel which had already been smouldering for some considerable time. And in the share which each party received of the honour of the victory the Presbyterians would appear to have really had

[1] Sanford, Great Rebellion, pp. 610, 611. Mr. Sanford says in a note: "She survived a widow till 1690, died at Towneley, and was interred in the family chapel at Burnley, aged ninety-one." He adds, "This anecdote was told Dr. Whitaker, the editor of Sir George Radcliffe's correspondence, by the representative of the family, aged 78, to whom it was related by his ancestress, Ursula Towneley, who had it from the lady herself"—and gives as his authority, Life and Correspondence of Sir George Radcliffe, by Dr. Whitaker, note, p. 165, quoted in *Gentleman's Magazine* for 1810.

some just ground of complaint that they had been by no means fairly dealt with. The measure which the Independents meted out to the Presbyterians is expressed in the words of a letter of Cromwell, written on the third day after the battle, and cited in a preceding note. "The left wing which I commanded, being our own horse, *saving a few Scots in our rear*, beat all the Prince's horse." Now there appears to be ample contemporary evidence that this is a very unfair statement of the facts. Baillie says: "The Independents sent up one quickly to assure that all the glory of that night was theirs; that they, and their General-Major Cromwell, had done it all their alone; but Captain Stuart afterwards showed the vanity and falsehood of their disgraceful relation. . . . The beginning of the victory was from David Lesley, who before was much suspected of evil designs: he with the Scots and Cromwell's horse, having the advantage of the ground, did dissipate all before them."[1] In a letter, dated London, July 16th, four days after the former, Baillie, in writing to another correspondent, thus mentions the same subject: "We were both grieved and angry that your Independents there should have sent up Major Harrison to trumpet over all the city their own praises to our prejudice, making all believe that Cromwell alone, with his unspeakably valorous regiments, had done all that service; that the most of us fled; and who stayed, they fought so and so, as it might be. We were much vexed with these reports, against which you were not pleased, any of you, to instruct us with any answer, till Lindesay's letters came at last, and Captain Stuart with his colours. Then we sent abroad our printed relations, and could lift up our face."[2]

[1] Baillie's Letters and Journals, ii. 203, 204. 3 vols. Edinburgh, 1841.
[2] Ibid., pp. 208, 209.

Now the Parliament's organ,[1] already cited, after stating that "Lieut.-Gen. Cromwell charged Prince Rupert's horse with exceeding great resolution, and maintained his charge with no less valour," thus proceeds: "Gen.-Major Lesley [Lieut.-Gen. David Leslie] charged the Earl of Newcastle's brigade of White Coats, and cut them wholly off, forty excepted, who were taken prisoners; and afterwards charged a brigade of Green Coats, whereof they cut off a great number, and put the rest to the rout; which service being performed, he charged the enemy's horse (with whom Lieut.-Gen. Cromwell was engaged) upon the flank, and in a very short space the enemy's whole cavalry was routed." And even the account published in Rushworth sufficiently establishes the unfairness of the statement quoted above from Cromwell's letter. "But at last Cromwell broke through, and at the same time the rest of the horse of that wing, and[2] Major-General Lesley's regiments (which behaved themselves very well) had wholly broken that right wing of the Prince's."[3]

The Presbyterians undoubtedly injured their cause by charges against Cromwell, which, from their outrageous absurdity, refuted themselves.[4] On the other hand, the result of a careful examination of all the evidence is an impression on my mind that justice was not done to David Leslie and his troops even at the time, and much less since,

[1] Merc. Brit., 8th July 1644, in "Cromwelliana," p. 10.

[2] For this word "and" should be substituted the words "consisting of."

[3] Rushworth, v. 634.

[4] Denzil Holles asserts ("Memoirs from the Year 1640 to 1648," pp. 15–17) that "his friend Cromwell," as he calls him, "had neither part nor lot in the business," and even goes so far as to charge him with downright cowardice. Holles professes to ground his allegation against Cromwell in regard to the battle of Marston Moor principally on the authority of one Major-General Crawford; and as to the storming of Basing House, on the authority of a certain Colonel Dalbier.

from the disposition so prevalent among mankind to worship success on a large scale, wherever it is to be found.

The Marquis of Newcastle, instead of endeavouring to lessen to his master the King the misfortune of the loss of the battle of Marston Moor, instantly left the kingdom.[1] It is said in his defence that he was disgusted with Rupert's rashness in fighting the battle; but it is a poor apology for a subordinate commander's abandoning his duty, that he had differed in opinion from his superior in regard to an action which had proved disastrous. His estate and influence in the northern district enabled him to raise an army. He was, according to the testimony of Mrs. Hutchinson, "so much beloved in his country, that when the first expedition was against the Scots, the gentlemen of the country sent him forth two troops, one all of gentlemen, the other of their men, who waited on him into the north at their own charges. He had, indeed, through his great estate, his liberal hospitality, and constant residence in his country, so endeared them to him, that no man was a greater prince in all that northern quarter, till a foolish ambition of glorious slavery carried him to Court, where he ran himself much into debt to purchase neglects of the King and Queen, and scorns of the proud courtiers."[2] But though, to borrow the language of Clarendon, "he liked the pomp and absolute authority of a general well, the substantial part and fatigue of a general he did not in any degree understand,

[1] Among those who accompanied Newcastle abroad was his brother, the Hon. Sir Charles Cavendish (it is spelt Candish in the newspapers of that time, "Cromwelliana," p. 2, as it was then pronounced), who is enumerated among the friends of Hobbes, and described as "Mathematicus summus." —Vitæ Hobbianæ Auctarium, pp. 181, 182. London, 1681.

[2] Memoirs of Colonel Hutchinson, p. 117. Bohn's edition. London, 1854.

being utterly unacquainted with war, nor would submit to it, but referred all matters of that nature to the discretion of his lieutenant-general, King."[1] The elements of his character, as it has been analysed by Clarendon, convey a tolerably exact representation of a nobility which shone with but a borrowed lustre, and was but a dim and feeble image of the nobility of the days either of Hotspur or De Montfort. "He loved monarchy, as it was the foundation and support of his own greatness; and the Church, as it was well constituted for the splendour and security of the Crown; and religion, as it cherished and maintained that order and obedience that were necessary to both, without any other passion for the particular opinions which were grown up in it, and distinguished it into parties, than as he detested whatsoever was like to disturb the public peace."[2] He was like others of his class in all times and countries,—at once brave and effeminate, frequently at critical junctures, unless when a battle was expected, and then he did not shun exposing his person, shutting himself up for two days at a time, denying access even to his lieutenant-general, that he might indulge his inordinate taste for music "or his softer pleasures."[3] In all this he presented a strong contrast to Montrose, who was not only brave, and the first, dismounted, to lead the way if his infantry scrupled to wade a river, but constantly drank water, and fed as simply and coarsely as the meanest kern who followed his colours.[4]

I have placed before the reader, as far as in my power, the means of judging in what degree the merit of the

[1] Clar. Hist., iv. 518. Oxford, 1826.

[2] Ibid., p. 517.

[3] Ibid., p. 519.

[4] Character of the Marquis of Montrose by one of his followers, in the Appendix to Wishart's Memoirs, p. 519. Edinburgh, 1819.

victory of Marston Moor belonged to Cromwell, and in what degree to David Leslie. Whatever the true proportions of that merit may be, it is certain that Cromwell reaped most of the credit and fame. It is also certain that if he was not entitled to quite so much as he obtained, he was entitled to a great deal. There were some persons, however, among both the English and Scottish Presbyterians whose jealousy and malignity induced them to attempt to deprive Cromwell not only of his just share, but of all share in the merit of that victory. At the opening of the Long Parliament, Holles had, both from his rank and his former persecution, been a much more conspicuous person than Cromwell. After the deaths of Hampden and Pym, he aspired to take the lead, but he did not possess the requisite abilities,—and Vane, Cromwell, and others soon threw him into the background. Holles then endeavoured to crush Cromwell by blasting his character through the circulation of a calumny set afoot by Crawford (Manchester's Major-General). Crawford, a Presbyterian Scot, had been encouraged in opposition to Cromwell, whom the Independents regarded as their head. Cromwell imputed to Crawford many faults, and the imputation seemed to be supported by Crawford's gross mismanagement of a mine with which he had been intrusted during the siege of York. By way of setting himself right, Crawford alleged that Cromwell, in the battle of Marston Moor, having been slightly wounded in the neck, had retired from the field, and was not present at the second charge. This allegation, which on the best evidence has been proved to have been utterly groundless,[1] was actually

[1] "Mr. Laing supposes," says Mr. Brodie, "that, as Baillie and Salmonet agree with Holles in regard to Cromwell's having been absent from the second charge in consequence of his wound, he must have retired to get it dressed; but had this author not been content with merely dipping into authorities, he

made by Holles the ground of an imputation of personal cowardice against Cromwell, an imputation which he urged with a pertinacity and rancour that furnish a sufficient measure of the weakness of his head to say nothing of his heart. But such calumnies, and the enmity of Holles's party and the Scots, only tended to raise still higher Cromwell's reputation, and to rivet still faster his hold on the whole body of the Independents.

It has been observed that the Independents, like the Presbyterians, claimed a monopoly of God, both sects declaring that their enemies were God's enemies. Yet there was a most important distinction between the two sects. For while the Presbyterians were intolerant of all forms of Christianity but their own, the principle of the Independents, which distinguished them from all sects of their time, and for which they were bitterly reviled by the Presbyterians, was toleration to all denominations of Christians whose religion they did not consider hostile to the State. If the Independents did not extend the principle of toleration to the Roman Catholics, the exception was in great part founded on the political ground that the Catholics, acknowledging a foreign spiritual dominion, and holding correspondence not only with it but with an organised clergy throughout Europe, and through them with the civil powers, were dangerous to the peace of a Protestant community. It is evident from this that a mortal quarrel was likely soon to arise between the Presbyterians and the Independents—a quarrel the crisis of which was hastened on by the increasing power of the Independents. The reputation which Cromwell obtained

would have found it acknowledged that the whole rested upon the word, accompanied indeed with oaths, of Crawford, and that Mr. Baillie seems latterly to have been ashamed of it."—Brodie's Hist., iii. 516, note.

by his services at Marston Moor by raising his own influence also advanced that of the Independents. All men who wished to see an end put to the war now looked to Cromwell and Fairfax, having discovered that no reliance was to be placed on the regularly bred soldiers—Essex, Leven, and Waller. And in the meantime the Scottish army did nothing but lie as a burden on the country by their plundering and licentiousness, which were strangely at variance with the rigid austerity of their preachers' tenets.[1]

York surrendered soon after the battle of Marston Moor. The Scottish army then marched northward, and being met by the Earl of Callender with an additional force of 10,000 men, sat down before Newcastle, which town, however, was not taken till October. The Earl of Manchester on his way south took some places; but Cromwell afterwards accused him of having neglected, and studiously shifted off, opportunities, as if he thought the King too low and the Parliament too high.

At Marston Moor the two armies were nearly equal as to numbers, and the battle was therefore decided, as almost all the battles of that war were (except Dunbar, where Cromwell attacked the head of the Scottish column and drove it in on its rear, pretty much as Frederick did with the French at Rosbach, and with the Austrians at Leuthen), by the two armies working away till the King's was totally defeated, chiefly by the superior discipline of Cromwell's troops.

[1] "Baillie's Letters," says Mr. Brodie, Hist., iii. 517, note, "are invaluable, as fully developing all this."—See Baillie, ii. 18, &c., of the old edition.

## CHAPTER XV.

*SECOND BATTLE OF NEWBURY—PRESBYTERIAN OLIGARCHY'S PLOT AGAINST CROMWELL—CROMWELL'S REMARKABLE SPEECH IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS, 9TH DECEMBER 1644—SELF-DENYING ORDINANCE—TREATY OF UXBRIDGE —EXECUTION OF LAUD.*

THE battle of Marston Moor gave to the Parliament the command of the north of England, but in the south and west the King's affairs were conducted with more success. Essex had been sent out about the middle of May with a force of 12,000 men, and Waller with a force of 10,000. The King also took the field, though with an army not equal in number to that of the Parliament. He therefore left Oxfordshire, as well to save Worcester as to draw the army of the Parliament into a country where the advantages of artillery, in which the King was inferior, might not be so much felt. Waller followed, but the King hearing that the Earl of Denbigh and others were ready to oppose his march, whereby he would have been in danger of being enclosed between two armies, returned rapidly towards Oxford. Waller overtook him near Banbury, but as the Cherwell ran between them, the two armies faced each other for a day without action. Next morning the King drew off his army, leaving a guard at Cropredy Bridge. Waller having forced the body of the King's troops that guarded Cropredy Bridge to retire, dispatched part of his cavalry to fall on the enemy's rear. But a

considerable portion of the Royal troops, having got between his cavalry and the bridge, intercepted their retreat. Waller thus suffered a great loss, and returned to London to recruit, after his usual fashion; for though he always carried out a fine army, such was his mismanagement that it soon melted away by desertion.[1]

Lyme had been besieged by Prince Maurice, and defended with great ability by Blake, who was afterwards to distinguish himself as one of the greatest, if not the greatest, of England's admirals. Essex, having obliged Prince Maurice to raise the siege of Lyme, and having taken Weymouth and other places, advanced farther west. The King followed him with a superior army, having received considerable reinforcements. Essex having relieved Plymouth, then besieged by Sir Richard Grenville, marched into Cornwall, expecting that Waller would hang upon the King's rear. But Waller—for the incompetence of these two Parliamentary generals was rendered more prominent and fatal by their jealousy of each other—pretended that he was not in a condition to march, and only sent 2500 horse and dragoons under General Middleton, who arrived too late. Essex, reduced to the last extremity, having stayed to see the full success of an attempt of Sir William Balfour to break through with his horse, fought his way to the shore near the mouth of the Fowey, and then, with many of his officers, on the 1st of September, embarked on board a ship which Warwick had sent round, and proceeded to Plymouth, leaving his foot to capitulate on the best terms they could. Skippon obtained good terms for his men,—that the common soldiers should lay down their arms, but the officers retain theirs, as well as their horses, and that the whole should

[1] Rush., v. 675, 676. Clar., iv. 490–496, *et seq.* Baillie's Letters, ii. 2, *et seq.*

be conveyed in safety to their own quarters, without any other condition than that they should not again bear arms till they reached Southampton.[1] The Parliament, though they had sufficient reason to be dissatisfied with the generalship of Essex, had the magnanimity to send Essex a letter, assuring him that their good affection to him and their opinion of his fidelity and merit in the public service were not at all lessened, and that they were resolved not to be wanting in their best endeavours for the repairing of this loss, for which purpose that they had written to the Earl of Manchester to march with all possible speed to Dorchester, with all the horse and foot he could get together; that they had also appointed 6000 arms for foot, 500 pair of pistols, and 6000 suits of clothes, to be sent to Portsmouth to make good the loss.[2] Afterwards, in the debate on the Self-denying Ordinance, Cromwell, in reference to the line of conduct which the Parliament pursued on this and other occasions, if not, indeed, throughout the whole course of the war, made this observation, so characteristic of his good sense: "But, if I may speak my conscience, without reflection upon any, I do conceive, if the army be not put into another method, and the war more vigorously prosecuted, the people can bear the war no longer, and will enforce you to a dishonourable peace. But this I would recommend to your prudence, not to insist upon any complaint or oversight of any commander-in-chief, upon any occasion whatever, for as I must acknowledge myself guilty of oversights, so I know they can rarely be avoided in military affairs."[3]

The army of the Parliament, composed of Essex's troops armed anew, of Manchester's and Waller's as well as Mid-

[1] Rush., v. 677, *et seq.* Whitelocke, p. 101, *et seq.* Clar., iv. 511, *et seq.*
[2] Parl. Hist., iii, 289, 290. [3] Ibid., pp. 326, 327.

dleton's, was soon in a condition to give battle to the Royalists. Donnington Castle (about two miles N.N.E. of Newbury), which was held for the King by a garrison under Captain John Boys, was besieged by a strong detachment of the Parliament's forces; but though the place was reduced to a heap of ruins, the garrison still held out, and the troops of the Parliament raised the siege on the approach of the King's army. The two armies met at Newbury on Sunday, the 27th of October. Essex was at this time in London, confined by indisposition, and the command fell to the Earl of Manchester, who had with him Cromwell as general of his cavalry. There was some sharp skirmishing on the afternoon of the 26th of October, the Parliament's forces endeavouring to drive the enemy from the town of Newbury. Night set in and the weather was very cold. The Parliamentary troops lay in the field, the Royalists in the town. On the following day, as Skippon had to march the foot by a considerable circuit to avoid the fire from Donnington Castle, out of which a party sallied upon them, it was three in the afternoon before the attack commenced. After a desperate conflict of three hours, success so inclined to the side of the Parliament, that night only prevented a total defeat of the Royalists. Four hundred prisoners and nine pieces of cannon were taken by the Parliamentary forces. Among the guns taken were six of those which Essex's troops had been obliged to give up in Cornwall. They were recovered by the very men who had been reduced to the humiliation of surrendering them, and who charged up to them with great impetuosity, and, embracing them as old friends, exclaimed, they would give them a "Cornish hug." Charles threw his artillery into Donnington Castle, and retreated towards Oxford. Cromwell proposed following him with

the whole of the cavalry, but this was opposed by the Earl of Manchester. Some days after, the King returned, and the two armies faced each other at Donnington Castle. But though the Parliamentary army was much superior to the King's in number, Charles was allowed to carry off the artillery which he had left in the castle. Cromwell afterwards brought a charge against Manchester for letting slip so favourable an opportunity to put an end to the war. After this both parties retired into winter quarters.[1]

It must be evident to any one who looks calmly at the course of events briefly narrated in the preceding pages, that the Parliamentary generals had on several occasions failed to make use of opportunities which were in their power of obtaining decisive results. Every one must then see that the charge brought by Cromwell against Manchester, for letting slip an opportunity after the second battle of Newbury for putting an end to the war, was not by any means groundless. Manchester, Essex, Denzil Holles,[2] and others, brought, indeed, counter-charges against Cromwell, the weight and justice of which may be in no small measure judged of by the fact that those charges comprehended the charge of cowardice, and the charge that Cromwell had said, "that it would never be well with England until the Earl of Manchester was made plain Mr. Montague; that the Assembly of Divines was a pack of persecutors; and that, if the Scots crossed the

[1] Rush. v. 718, *et seq.* Whitelocke, p. 107. Ludlow i., 127, *et seq.* Clar., iv. 542, *et seq.*

[2] Though this name seems to be now printed Hollis, Denzil himself wrote it Holles. At least it is so written in his letters to his brother-in-law the Earl of Strafford. (See Strafford's Letters and Despatches, i. 40, 41). And the title of his memoirs, published in 1699, is "Memoirs of Denzil Lord Holles." Thomas Pelham also, Duke of Newcastle, who assumed the name of Holles, his mother being Grace Holles, sister of the late Marquis of Clare (of which family was Denzil Holles), also signed his name "Holles Newcastle," as appears from many autograph letters of his which I have seen.

Tweed only to establish Presbyterianism, he would as soon draw his sword against them as against the King."

The fact is, that as there had hitherto been but two parties, namely, that of the King and that of the Parliament, there now begun to appear three, the party of the Parliament being divided into two, that of the Presbyterians and that of the Independents.

Those who associate with the word Presbyterianism a plain, unornamented, somewhat republican form of religious worship, and thence conclude that the Presbyterians of that day were a republican or democratical party, will form an erroneous conclusion. Presbyterianism was, indeed, then the national form of religious worship in Scotland. But, accurately speaking, there was at that time no Scottish nation. The people of Scotland were in a state of servitude under a most tyrannical oligarchy, and the Scottish commissioners who joined with the English Presbyterians in the attack upon Cromwell and the English Independents were the representatives of that oligarchy. These Scottish commissioners and the English Presbyterian leaders met at the house of the Earl of Essex in London, and held private consultations upon the question of proceeding against Cromwell as an "incendiary" between the two nations of England and Scotland. It will be recollected that the Scots had designated Strafford as an "incendiary," and in his case the word had been found to be a word of power in helping the destruction of that obnoxious minister. A similar course was now devised against Cromwell. But those who devised it soon discovered to their cost that in Cromwell they had to deal with a man very different from Strafford.

Very late one evening, Maynard and Whitelocke were sent for to Essex House, for the purpose of being con-

sulted, as two able English lawyers, whether Cromwell came under the meaning of the word "incendiary" in English law. After Essex had made the two lawyers a very flattering speech, Loudon, the Lord Chancellor of Scotland, one of the commissioners from the Scottish Parliament, and one of the worst of that corrupt oligarchy, made them a speech, in which he said: "You ken vary weel that General-Lieutenant Cromwell is not only no friend to us, and to the government of our Church, but he is also no well-willer to his Excellence [Essex], whom you and we all have cause to love and honour; and if he be permitted to go on in his ways, it may, I fear, endanger the whole business: therefore we are to advise of some course to be taken for prevention of that mischief. You ken vary weel the concord 'twixt the twa kingdoms, and the union by the Solemn League and Covenant, and, if any be an incendiary between the twa nations, how is he to be proceeded against? Now the matter is, wherein we desire your opinions, what you tak the meaning of this word incendiary to be, and whether Lieutenant-General Cromwell be not sik an incendiary as is meant thereby, and whilk way wud be best to tak to proceed against him, if he be proved to be sik an incendiary, and that will clip his wings from soaring to the prejudice of our cause. Now you may ken that by our law in Scotland we clepe him an incendiary whay kindleth coals of contention, and raiseth differences in the State to the public damage, and he is *tanquam publicus hostis patriæ;* whether your law be the same or not, you ken best, who are meikle learned therein, and therefore, with the favour of his Excellence, we desire your judgment in these points."

To this question the lawyers replied that the word incendiary meant the same thing in English law that it

did in Scotch, but that whether Lieutenant-General Cromwell was such an incendiary could be known only by proofs; that it would ill suit persons of so great honour and authority to bring forward any such public accusation unless they could see beforehand that it could be clearly made out, and that it would be wise to consider Cromwell's present condition, parts, and interest, his weight in the House of Commons, his interest in the army, he being also not "wanting of friends in the House of Peers, nor of abilities to manage his own part or defence to the best advantage;" that they had not yet heard any particulars stated, or knew any themselves, which would amount to a proof clear enough to satisfy the House of Commons, and they advised them not to attack Cromwell rashly. Mr. Holles, Sir Philip Stapleton, and some others "spake smartly to the business, and would willingly have been upon the accusation of him," but the Scottish commissioners were more cautious, and "the blow was given up for the present." Whitelocke and Maynard were dismissed with thanks at about two hours after midnight. Whitelocke adds that they had cause to believe that, at this debate, some who were present were false brethren, and informed Cromwell of all that passed.[1] Cromwell was not a man to neglect such a hint. He immediately proceeded to action, and as the contest in which he was about to engage was one of vital importance, I will attempt to explain briefly the nature of it.

According to the present very inaccurate phraseology, the two parties, at the head of which respectively were Essex and Cromwell, would be called the aristocratical and democratical parties, into which the Parliament of England was then divided. But more accurately they

[1] Whitelocke, pp. 116, 117.

may be termed the oligarchical and aristocratical parties. For it was the object of Essex's party that England should select those men who were to lead her councils and command her armies, not for their fitness, but for their wealth and rank; while it was the object of Cromwell's party that fitness alone should be looked to in the selection, without regard to either rank or wealth. Therefore Cromwell's object was an aristocracy in the sense used by Aristotle, as opposed to oligarchy—*the rule of the best.* But the word had another meaning—*the rule of the best-born;* and this was Essex and Holles's aristocracy—an aristocracy of titles, pedigrees, and rents. What a nation would sink to under such an aristocracy as that of Holles we may judge by the state of the English army, when Holles's friends gave commissions to their footmen; when Ensign Northerton and the Captain in Hamilton's Bawn[1] were the representatives of a class; when the last alternative of a man of quality's lackey was a commission in the army or to take to the highway. The reader may then judge of the spirit which animated these oligarchical Presbyterians, when they sought to hunt down a man as a public enemy because he sought to form an army such that for efficiency it has never been equalled upon earth, instead of an army composed of lackeys, officered by stupid debauchees, and commanded by men whose chief recommendation for command was their being Peers possessed of large fortunes.[2]

[1] It appears from a passage in Swift's "Essay on Modern Education" that he drew his captain in "Hamilton's Bawn" from the life, and that if there were better officers at that time in the English army, they were exceptions to the general rule which then formed the class.

[2] The Duke of Wellington thus writes on the 18th of July 1813, soon after the battle of Vittoria: "It is an unrivalled army for fighting, if the soldiers can only be kept in their ranks during the battle." His Grace then, after mentioning some of its defects, thus proceeds: "The cause of these defects is

But while the English and Scottish oligarchical party, who, under the name of religion, sought for absolute power and unbounded wealth, were thus plotting at midnight to destroy Cromwell, that sagacious person was consulting with Vane and St. John how they might break the neck of the Presbyterian oligarchy, and get the command of the army out of the hands of a set of men who had abundantly proved their incapacity to finish a war which was desolating and ruining their country. The effect of the deliberations of Cromwell and his friends soon appeared.

On the 9th of December, the House of Commons having resolved themselves into a grand committee to consider of the sad condition of the kingdom by the continuance of the war, there was a general silence for a good space of time, many looking upon one another to see who would break the ice and speak first, on so tender and sharp a

the want of habits of obedience and attention to orders by the inferior officers, and, indeed, I might add, by all. They never attend to an order with an intention to obey it, or sufficiently to understand it, be it ever so clear, and therefore, never obey it when obedience becomes troublesome or difficult or important."—Gurwood's Selections from the Duke of Wellington's Despatches, p. 713, No. 799. The duke has also thrown further light on the means by which Cromwell's army became a machine so perfect as even to exceed the perfection of that army of which his Grace said: "I always thought that I could have gone anywhere and done anything with that army."—Ibid., p. 929—Evidence on Military Punishments. The duke says: "Indeed, we carry this principle of the gentleman, and the absence of intercourse with those under his command, so far as that, in my opinion, the duty of a subaltern officer as done in a foreign army is not done at all in the cavalry or the British infantry of the line. It is done in the guards by the sergeants. Then our gentleman officer, however admirable his conduct in a field of battle, however honourable to himself, however glorious and advantageous to his country, is but a poor creature in disciplining his company in camp, quarters, or cantonments."—Ibid., p. 920—Memorandum on Plan for altering the Discipline of the Army. Of the neglect of the General Order as to the officers commanding companies inspecting the ammunition at every parade, in order to ascertain that every soldier in the ranks has at all times in his possession sixty rounds, "the consequence is, as happened in a late instance, that before the soldiers are engaged for five minutes, ammunition is wanting, and the stores are necessarily exhausted, at a great distance from all means of supply."—Ibid., p. 626.

point. At last Cromwell rose, and said, "It is now a time to speak, or for ever to hold the tongue;[1] the important occasion being no less than to save a nation out of a bleeding, nay, almost dying, condition, which the long continuance of the war hath already brought it into; so that, without a more speedy, vigorous, and effectual prosecution of the war, casting off all lingering proceedings, like soldiers of fortune beyond sea, to spin out a war, we shall make the kingdom weary of us, and hate the name of a Parliament. For what do the enemy say? Nay, what do many say that were friends at the beginning of the Parliament? Even this, that the members of both Houses have got great places and commands, and the sword into their hands; and what by interest in Parliament, and what by power in the army, will perpetually continue themselves in grandeur, and not permit the war speedily to end, lest their own power should determine with it. This I speak here, to our own faces, is but what others do utter abroad behind our backs. I am far from reflecting on any. . . ." He then went on to advise the House in the words quoted a few pages back, not to insist upon any oversight of any commander-in-chief, acknowledging himself guilty of oversights which he said he knew could rarely be avoided in military affairs, and thus concluded: "Therefore, waiving a strict inquiry into the causes of these things, let us apply ourselves to the remedy which is most necessary; and I hope we have such true English hearts, and zealous affections towards the general weal of our mother country, as no members of either House will scruple to deny themselves and their own private interests,

[1] Milton may have had these remarkable words in his mind when he composed the line—

"Awake, arise, or be for ever fallen!"

for the public good, nor account it to be a dishonour done to them, whatever the Parliament shall resolve upon in this weighty matter."[1]

Another member, whose name has not been preserved, followed Cromwell, and said—"Whatever be the cause, two summers are passed over, and we are not saved. Our victories (the price of blood invaluable) so gallantly gotten, and, which is more pity, so graciously bestowed, seem to have been put into a bag with holes; for what we won at one time, we lost at another; the treasure is exhausted, the country wasted. A summer's victory has proved but a winter's story; the game, however shut up with autumn, was to be new played again the next spring; as if the blood that has been shed were only to manure the field of war for a more plentiful crop of contention. Men's hearts have failed them with the observation of these things, the cause whereof the Parliament has been tender of ravelling into. But men cannot be hindered from venting their opinions privately, and their fears, which are various, and no less variously expressed, concerning which I determine nothing; but this I would say, it is apparent that the forces being under several great commanders, want of good correspondency amongst the chieftains has sometimes hindered the public service."[2]

The result of this debate was a vote, "That no member of either House of Parliament should, during the war, enjoy or execute any office or command civil or military, and

[1] Parl. Hist., iii. 326, 327. Of this speech of Cromwell's, Mr. Brodie truly remarks, "This I conceive to be a sufficient proof of Cromwell's powers as a public speaker."—Brodie's Hist., iii. 549, note. The fact is that Cromwell, like Tiberius, always spoke, as well as wrote, clearly and to the point, when his object was one which he was willing to avow. His speeches, after he had turned out the Long Parliament, and when he was Protector, are in a different style.

[2] Ibid., p. 327.

that an ordinance should be brought in accordingly.[1] On the 17th of December this ordinance was read a third time in the House of Commons, and passed;[2] but it was rejected by the Lords.[3] Another ordinance, with the same name, though not the same in effect with the original "Self-denying Ordinance," as it was called, was introduced a short time after, and passed by both Houses. The Lords passed it on the 3d of April 1645, Essex, Manchester, and Denbigh having resigned their commissions on the 1st of April,[4] after the Commons had passed an ordinance for new modelling the army, and had voted Sir Thomas Fairfax to be commander of it.[5] But this ordinance only enacted that every member of either House of Parliament was thereby "discharged, at the end of forty days after the passing of that ordinance, from every office or command, military or civil, conferred by both or either of the said Houses, or by authority derived therefrom, since the 20th of November 1640."[6] It will be observed that this ordinance, though it discharged all members from the offices and commands they held at that time, did not prohibit them from being afterwards appointed to offices or commands. The ordinance was not a prospective command. It simply ordered something to be done "at the end of forty days after the passing of this ordinance;" and then, as regarded that point (for it contained other provisions), expired.[7] Consequently, when at the end of

[1] Parl. Hist., iii. 327. [2] Ibid., p. 330. [3] Ibid., p. 333.
[4] Ibid., pp. 352–354. [5] Ibid., p. 340. [6] Ibid., p. 355.

[7] Lord Clarendon's account of this transaction is altogether a fiction. Hume, who has followed Clarendon, though he cites Rushworth and Whitelocke at the bottom of the page, after describing the first ordinance, and saying that the Peers "even ventured once to reject it," goes on to relate that they finally passed "the ordinance," taking especial care to leave his readers in ignorance of the difference between the ordinance rejected and the ordinance passed. The argument of the Royalist Tract, printed in 1660, entituled, "The Mystery of the

those forty days, Cromwell, with the rest, was discharged from his command by force of the ordinance, the Parliament were not restricted by the ordinance from reappointing him or any one else. It was, probably, in consequence of some doubt as to the precise operation of the ordinance that the Parliament, at the special request of Fairfax, granted a dispensation to Cromwell to enable Fairfax to avail himself of Cromwell's services at the battle of Naseby.

In the meantime, Charles's Parliament at Oxford, his mongrel Parliament, as he himself called it, which was not acquainted with his secret designs, only confided to a select few (and this is the best and the true defence of many of the gallant and honourable men who supported him), were clamorous for peace. And as even his council insisted upon his acknowledging the Parliament at Westminster to be the Parliament of England, he was obliged to comply, but he made an entry in the register that *calling* them was not *acknowledging* them.[1] It having been settled that a treaty should be held at Uxbridge, commissioners were appointed by both sides. The important points of discussion were

Good Old Cause," proceeds on the same hypothesis. The title, in full, of this tract, which has been reprinted in the Appendix to the 3d volume of the New Parliamentary History, is "The Mystery of the Good Old Cause, briefly unfolded in a catalogue of such members of the late Long Parliament that held their places, both civil and military, contrary to the Self-denying Ordinance of April 3, 1645. Together with the sums of money and lands which they divided among themselves during their sitting (at least such as were disposed of by them publicly). London, printed in the first year of England's liberty, after almost twenty years' slavery, 1660." It is now pretty well known what was the nature of the liberty England enjoyed in this "first year of its liberty." It is remarkable that the compilers of this 3d volume of the New Parliamentary History (London, 1808) should take pretty much the same view of the Long Parliament as if they had been writing under the happy auspices of Charles II., in 1660, while in the body of their work they print evidence which confutes their own conclusions.

[1] Charles's Letters in the King's Cabinet Opened.—Rush., v. 942, *et seq.*

the militia and religion, the conduct of the Irish war, and the pacification Ormond had made with the Catholics. As the King was firmly resolved not to concede these, the treaty at Uxbridge, as was to be expected, proved abortive.[1] It is evident that nothing could have resulted towards a firm peace from such a treaty, for if Charles's private opinion was that *calling* the two Houses a Parliament was not *acknowledging* them, he might, in accordance with such opinion, afterwards declare that any agreement with them was altogether void.[2]

On the 10th of January, Laud, after having been a prisoner in the Tower for almost four years, was beheaded on Tower Hill. It is possible that he might have lain forgotten in the Tower, and been suffered to end his days there quietly, had not the King sent him a letter requiring him, as often as any benefice in his gift should fall vacant, to dispose of it only to such as he (the King) should name; or if he had received any command to the contrary from either, or both Houses of Parliament, to let them fall into lapse, that he might dispose of them as he

[1] Parl. Hist., iii. 344. Charles had determined beforehand that the treaty should be abortive. "My commissioners," he wrote to the Queen, "are so well chosen, though I say it, that they will neither be threatened nor disputed from the grounds I have given them, which, upon my word, is according to the little note thou rememberest; and in this not only their obedience but their judgments concur." And in another letter he mentions his "being now freed from the place of base and mutinous motions, that is to say, our mongrel Parliament here."—See Brodie, iii. 578.

[2] As to the treaty of Uxbridge, see Rush., v. 841, *et seq.* Clar. State Papers, ii. 186. It has been fully proved that neither Charles nor his advisers, with, perhaps, the exception of Hyde, regarded the form of Church Government in any other light than that of a State engine. In addition to the other evidence in support of this, Mr. Brodie (Hist., iii. 574, note) cites from the MSS. Brit. Mus., Ayscough, 4161, some letters from Charles to the Queen, in which he justifies himself for refusing his consent to the Presbyterian Government, entirely on the principle of policy, and says that on this account he considered the Episcopal Government of more importance to his authority than even the militia.

chose. It was after Laud had declined to obey an order of the Lords in a case of this sort that they sent a message to the Commons to expedite his trial.[1] The argument in Strafford's case applies to Laud's, but Sergeant Wild, Mr. Samuel Brown, and Mr. Nicholas were sent by the Commons to show the Lords, in a conference,[2] that a man might incur the guilt of high treason as much by offences against the nation,[3] as by offences against the King; and to contend that there were two kinds of treason—those which were against the King, and cognisable by the inferior courts—and those that were against the realm, and subject only to the judgment of Parliament. In accordance with this line of argument, Laud was proceeded against by Bill of Attainder as Strafford had been. Heylin says that the Bill of Attainder was passed in the Lords "in a thin and slender House, not above six or seven in number."[4] Yet it appears from the journals, as Mr. Hallam has remarked, that there were twenty Peers present at the time of prayers.[5] Some of the bigots who had brought him to the block, whose intolerance and tyranny were about equal to his own, attempted to disturb his last moments

[1] Laud, in his History of his Troubles and Trials, says, p. 203, "I foresaw a cloud rising over me, about the business of Chartham."

[2] Rush. v. 830.

[3] It might be a question whether this word would have been used before the battle of Marston Moor. The Tudors and Stuarts had no idea of a nation except as a beast of burden to pay taxes. How could high treason be committed against such a thing? But there was one man, at least, in England, who, "in a way of foolish simplicity," as he termed it, was to find a solution of the question from which there was no appeal. "And now," says an eye-witness of the battle of Marston Moor (cited, by Mr. Sanford, p. 398), as Rupert and Cromwell were facing each other waiting for the onset, "and now the sword must determine that which a hundred years' policy and dispute could not do."

[4] Heylin's Life of Laud, p. 527.

[5] Lords' Journals, 4th January 1644.

with some impertinent questions, to call them by the mildest name. Laud had before said, as he pulled off his doublet, "No man can be more willing to send me out of the world than I am willing to be gone;" and now, after answering one or two of these questions, he turned to the executioner, and said, as he put some money into his hand, "Here, honest friend, God forgive thee, as I do, and do thy office upon me with mercy." Then kneeling down and laying his head upon the block, he said aloud, "Lord, receive my soul"—the signal agreed upon between him and the executioner—who thereupon struck off his head at a single blow.

Laud's sentence was so far mitigated, that the manner of his execution was altered to beheading. He was also permitted to dispose of his property by will, and his body was allowed burial. The character of this archbishop, and the opinion I have formed of it from a careful, and, I believe, impartial examination of the evidence, have sufficiently appeared in this history. Yet there is something extremely touching in the manner in which he alludes in his will to the place of his education, St. John's College, Oxford, which might be truly considered as the *alma mater* of his prosperous fortunes. Those whose early associations, like his, are agreeably linked with the college where they have passed some of the happiest years of their existence—those years bright "with golden exhalations of the dawn," so full of enjoyment for the present and hope for the future, will fully sympathise with the poor, infirm old man, who might almost be said, like his predecessor Wolsey, to have "trod the ways of glory, and sounded all the depths and shoals of honour." After stating that to St. John's College he leaves all his chapel

plate and furniture, his books, and £500, he adds with simple pathos, "Something else I have done for them already, according to my ability; and God's everlasting blessing be upon that place and that society for ever."[1]

[1] Among other memorials of Archbishop Laud preserved in St. John's College, Oxford, is the staff with which he walked to execution.

BOMBAY BRANCH OF THE ASIATIC SOC.

## CHAPTER XVI.

*THE HIGHLANDERS OF SCOTLAND—MONTROSE'S VICTORIES AND CRUELTIES.*

CHARLES, as has been shown, had no thought of peace when he made a show of it by engaging in the Treaty of Uxbridge. The King's confidence in yet being able to gain more by the sword than by negotiation, arose in a great measure from events which occurred in a remote part of Britain,—the Highlands of Scotland, a district at that time almost totally unknown to Englishmen; indeed, nearly a century later a well-informed writer observes that there had been less at that time written on the Highlands of Scotland than on either of the Indies.[1] The principal agents in the events to which I allude were the Earl of Montrose and the Highlanders of Scotland, the descendants of the ancient northern Picts,—for it has been proved by Mr. Skene that the effects of the Scottish conquest did not extend to the northern Picts, but were exclusively confined to the southern Picts, or Picts inhabiting the Lowlands; that the northern Picts were altogether for a considerable time unaffected by that conquest, and remained in some degree independent of the Scottish dynasty, which, from the time of that conquest, ruled over the other parts of Scotland.[2]

[1] Letters from a Gentleman in the North of Scotland, i. 5. New edition. London, 1815.

[2] Skene's Highlanders of Scotland, vol. i. chaps. 3, 4. In a letter dated August 13, 1766, Dr. Johnson, among other arguments against the opposition to the scheme of translating the Bible into the Erse or Gaelic language, uses

Whether the Highlanders of Scotland went so far as the people mentioned by ancient writers, who, not only thought robbery no disgrace, but even thought it disgraceful not to live on plunder,[1] the Scottish Highlanders drew this distinction, that, while they considered the driving off a herd of cattle the act of brave men, they considered stealing a cow a "dirty thing they would have scorned to do."[2] And

the argument that such a translation will be a method of preserving the Highland language, and says, "I am not very willing that any language should be totally extinguished. The similitude and derivation of languages afford the most indubitable proof of the traduction of nations, and the genealogy of mankind. They add often physical certainty to historical evidence; and often supply the only evidence of ancient migrations, and of the revolutions of ages which left no written monuments behind them."—Boswell's Life of Johnson, iii. 11, 12. London, John Murray, 1835. Mr. Skene's valuable work on the Highlanders of Scotland forms a most instructive commentary on this text. "The history of the Celtic language," says Max Müller, "runs on to the present day. A language, as long as it is spoken by anybody, lives and has its substantive existence. Without the help of history we should see that English is Teutonic, that, like Dutch and Friesian, it belongs to the Low-German branch; that this branch together with the High-German, Gothic, and Scandinavian branches, constitutes the Teutonic class; that this Teutonic class, together with the Celtic, Slavonic, Hellenic, Italic, Iranic, and Indic classes, constitutes the great Indo-European or Aryan family of speech."—Lectures on the Science of Language, pp. 73, 74. Fourth edition. London, 1864. "The Celts seem to have been the first of the Aryans to arrive in Europe; but the presence of subsequent migrations, particularly of Teutonic tribes, has driven them towards the most westerly parts, and latterly from Ireland across the Atlantic. At present the only remaining dialects are the Kymric and Gædhelic. The Kymric comprises the Welsh, the Cornish, lately extinct, and the Armorican of Britanny. The Gædhelic comprises the Irish, the Gaelic of the west coast of Scotland, and the dialect of the Isle of Man."—Ibid., p. 203.

[1] Οὐκ ἔχοντός πω αἰσχύνην τούτου τοῦ ἔργου, φέροντος δέ τι καὶ δοξης μᾶλλον.—Thucyd., I. 5. The picture drawn by Ovid, writing some 400 years after Thucydides, of the tribes round Tomi—Thracians, Getæ, Scythians, Sarmatians—is to the same effect:

"Inumeræ gentes, . . .
Quæ sibi non rapto vivere turpe putant."
Trist. v. 10.

[2] "Sic dirty things they wad hae scorned to do,
But tooming faulds, or scouring o' a glen,
Was ever deemed the deed o' pretty men."
Ross's "Fortunate Shepherdess."

as regards highway-robbery, Captain Burt declares the Highlands to be safer than the highway from London to Highgate in the early part of last century; and adds, that he cannot approve the Lowland saying, "Show me a Highlander, and I will show you a thief."[1] Though to live on rapine, not on honest industry, is equally opposed to civilisation and morality, whether it is conducted on a large or on a small scale, the effect on the character of the individual is different; for in the one case the practice is consistent with a high degree of hardihood and courage, and even in some degree with generosity and honour, while in the other case it is not. The Highlander's moral view of the matter was also supported by his belief, which a modern writer[2] has proved to be well founded, that he only took the cattle of the foreigners who had robbed him of his country, and had driven him from the Lowlands of Scotland into the barren mountains.

The difference between the feudal and the Highland law of succession may in some degree account for the failure of male representatives of the head of a family being much less frequent according to the Highland law of succession than it was according to the feudal. In the first place, by the Highland law of succession the brothers of the chief succeeded before the sons to the chiefship and the superiority of the lands belonging to the clan.[3] In the second place, the existence of legitimate sons to a chief

[1] Letters from the North of Scotland, ii. 218. New edition. London, 1815.

[2] Skene's Highlanders of Scotland. 2 vols. London, 1837. Mr. Skene has proved the tradition of the Highlanders, that the Lowlands in old times were the possession of their ancestors, to be founded on historical fact. Mr. Skene bears testimony to the accuracy of Captain Burt. After quoting Captain Burt's description of the peculiarities of the Highland clan given in Letter xix., he says, "To this concise and admirable description it is unnecessary to add anything further."—Skene, i. 158.

[3] Skene's Highlanders of Scotland, i. 159, 161.

was secured by a custom termed handfasting, or a handfast marriage, which consisted in a contract between two chiefs, by which it was agreed that the heir of the one should live with the daughter of the other as her husband for twelve months and a day. If in that time the lady became a mother, or proved to be with child, the marriage became good in law; otherwise the contract was considered at an end. The Highlanders drew a strong distinction between bastard sons and the issue of these handfast unions, whom they considered legitimate, and they rigorously excluded from succession of any sort the illegitimate offspring.[1]

But this difference between the Highland and the feudal law of succession does not by any means support the pretensions of the Highlanders generally to the superior antiquity of race and purity of lineage which they claim over the rest of mankind. The supposition of whole clans being of royal descent is a puerile absurdity, and is directly opposed by the notorious fact of the Highland clans recruiting their numbers, when numbers constituted strength, by holding out inducements to any man to assume his clan name. Mr. Skene repeatedly mentions this as done by the Campbells.[2] And in Aberdeenshire, with every allowance for the operation of the patriarchal principle, how many "boll-of-meal"[3] Gordons are there for one Gordon

[1] Skene's Highlanders of Scotland, i. 166, 167.

[2] Mr. Skene, after showing the total groundlessness of the derivation of the name Campbell from Campo Bello, the oldest spelling of it being Cambel or Kambel, and there never having been a Norman family of the name of Campo Bello, thus concludes his account of the Clan Campbell :—"The history of this family consists principally of the details of a policy characterised by cunning and perfidy, although deep and far-sighted, and which obtained its usual success in the acquisition of great temporal grandeur and power."—The Highlanders of Scotland, ii. 284.

[3] Those who had assumed the name of Gordon for a boll of meal, and their descendants, are so called.

who can produce a pedigree that would bear a legal investigation—that is, who can trace a descent upon legal evidence from the Gordon family?

The notion of blood-relationship to the chiefs, however, whether well founded or not, while it made them yield a blind and unbounded submission to the will of their chiefs in all things, however tyrannical, however cruel that will might be, was thus the more favourable to the object of Montrose—the attempt to establish on the throne of Britain a king who required from his subjects an obedience as unreasoning and as unbounded as the Highlander rendered to his chief. It may indeed be said that a Highland chief who was a humane and just man—and some, perhaps many, of them were such—would use his absolute, power for the good and happiness of his subjects, and would have an additional inducement to do so in the notion that they were his children as well as subjects. Nevertheless, any well-attested facts that have come to us show the internal condition of the Highlanders under their chiefs to have been very miserable, and prove that they suffered often the extremities of hunger and cold, and habitually the consequences of an insufficient quantity of wholesome food, and of the total disregard of personal cleanliness common to men in that stage of society, and, moreover, were subjected to most cruel and tyrannical treatment by their chiefs. The effects of all this showed themselves in the personal appearance of the common Highlanders, in their short stature and in their features. "The gentry," says Captain Burt, "may be said to be a handsome people, but the commonalty much otherwise; one would hardly think by their faces they were of the same species, at least of the same country, which plainly proceeds from their bad food, smoke at home, and snow, wind, and rain abroad;

17725

because the young children have as good features as any I have seen in other parts of the island."[1]

But with all this, the Highlanders' hardihood and power of enduring wet and cold, sleeping on the snow-covered heath of a hillside wrapped in their plaids soaked in some burn to keep out the wind, and esteeming a snowball for a pillow as an effeminate luxury, rendered them very fit for soldiers in one important particular. Their activity and power of enduring fatigue were equal to their hardihood and power of enduring wet and cold. They were also accustomed to the use of arms from their boyhood. They were not, indeed, "fencers,"[2] as an eminent writer has called them, probably by a slip of the pen. But they were first-rate marksmen, and first-rate broadsword-men, or sword-and-buckler men. They carried a round target of light wood, covered with strong leather, and studded with brass or iron. In encountering musketeers, before the effective introduction of the bayonet, they had a great advantage; and even after such introduction, they received the thrust of the bayonet in their bucklers, twisted it aside, and used the broadsword against the encumbered soldier. According to Captain Grose, so late as 1747, the privates of the 42d Regiment, then in Flanders, were for the most part permitted to carry targets.[3] But the Duke

[1] Letters from the North of Scotland, ii. 107.

[2] This distinction is well expressed by Sir Walter Scott when he says in the "Lady of the Lake," of Fitz-James as trained to the use of the rapier, in contradistinction to Rhoderick Dhu, who had been trained only to the use of the broadsword and buckler—

"Fitz-James's blade was sword and shield,"

meaning that his rapier served him both for offence and defence—that is, both for sword and shield.

[3] Military Antiquities, i. 164. See the account of an encounter between a Frenchman with a rapier and a Highlander with a broadsword and target, quoted by Sir Walter Scott in the notes to the "Lady of the Lake," from verses between Swift and Sheridan, in which the Frenchman, enraged that, while cut

of Cumberland during the rebellion of 1745[1] made an alteration in the mode of managing the bayonet against the Highlanders, which deprived the latter in some measure of their advantage. Whereas before each bayonet-man attacked the swordsman fronting him, he was now directed to attack the swordsman fronting his right-hand man. He was thus covered by his adversary's target where he was open on his left, and the right of the adversary fronting his right-hand man was open to him. Mr. Skene[2] says, there is little doubt that Montrose could after his last victory at Kilsyth have placed Charles on the throne, but for the habit of the Highlanders of returning home after every battle to secure their spoil. From this opinion I altogether dissent. Subsequent events proved that the charge of the Highlanders, however furious, could make small impression on the firm array of Cromwell's pikemen; while no enemy they ever encountered proved able to withstand the charge of Cromwell's cavalry.

A good deal has been said of late years respecting the (alleged) aversion of the Highlanders to all useful industry, even to that which the ancient Romans, with all their love of war, looked upon as a highly honourable occupation, agriculture, as derogatory to their dignity and their manhood. They are represented as leaving, like the North American Indians and other savages, all work except war or rapine to be performed by their women; and lying basking in the sun while their pregnant wives were employed in digging or carrying heavy burdens. But Captain

and slashed himself, he could not touch the Highlander by reason of the target, which caught all his thrusts, is represented as exclaiming, "Sirrah, you rascal, &c., me will fight you, be gar! if you'll come from your door."

[1] According to a letter published shortly after in the "Scots' Magazine."

[2] Highlanders of Scotland, i. 140.

Burt, the English officer of Engineers quartered for several years at Inverness in the early part of the last century, positively asserts from his own experience that nothing could be more unjust than the received notion that the ordinary Highlanders are an indolent lazy people. "I know the contrary," he says, "by troublesome experience; I say troublesome, because, in a certain affair wherein I had occasion to employ great numbers and gave them good wages, the solicitations of others for employment were very earnest, and would hardly admit of a denial: they are as willing as other people to mend their way of living; and when they have gained strength from substantial food, they work as well as others; but why should a people be branded with the name of idles in a country where there is generally no profitable business for them to do?"[1]

But it was the policy of the chiefs to discourage as much as possible not only all education[2]—that is, all knowledge—but all profitable employment that might release their clansmen from the condition of abject slavery in which they lived. Of this cruel tyranny on the part of

[1] Letters from the North of Scotland, Letter xix., ii. 101, 102. New edition. London, 1815.

[2] The testimony of Burt is confirmed by a MS. in the British Museum, entitled "The Highlands of Scotland described, with some Observations concerning the late Rebellion," that of 1745, from which Mr. Hill Burton has made the following quotation in his "Life of Simon Lord Lovat," pp. 160, 161: "The late Lord Lovat was a singular man in many respects, but in two things he distinguished himself: first, he not only discouraged all the schools that were erected in his country, and declared himself an enemy to all those who educated their children at home, but also was at great pains to convince the chiefs and principal gentlemen in the Highlands, far and near, how much their interest would suffer by them; secondly, he did more towards reviving a clannish spirit (which had greatly declined since the Revolution) than any man in the whole country, and used all popular arts to impress upon the minds of the present and rising generation, how sacred a character that of chief or chieftain was."

the chiefs, and the abject slavery on that of the clans, I will give some well-attested proofs. One of the chiefs had occasion for three or four of his clan employed as stated above by the engineer officer, and on his offering them sixpence a day each—at that time in that country high wages, even if they had not been his vassals—in consideration of his having taken them from other employment, they remonstrated, and said he injured them in calling them from sixteenpence a day to sixpence. "And I may well remember," adds Captain Burt, "he then told me, that if any of those people had formerly said as much to their chief, they would have been carried to the next rock and precipitated."[1] This shows the sort of tyranny under which the Highlanders lived; and what follows will show that what Lord Lovat meant by keeping up "a clannish spirit," and "impressing upon the minds of the present and rising generation how sacred a character that of chief was," amounted to the assertion of the claim on the part of the chiefs to hang men up by the heels on trees, or throw them down precipices, without any law but their own will and pleasure. The reader is probably acquainted with the story told by Sir Walter Scott[2] of the young man whom his uncle, a chief of the Western Isles, threw into the pit or deep dark dungeon of his castle, and having first kept him without food till his appetite grew voracious, and then let down a quantity of salt beef which the unhappy prisoner eagerly devoured, left him to perish by the raging thirst which that food had excited. King, in his description of life at Castle Dounie, the residence of Lord Lovat, which he gives from the reminiscences of James Ferguson, the astronomer, who in the

[1] Letters, ii. 103.

[2] History of Scotland, contained in Tales of a Grandfather, chap. xxxviii.

early part of his life was constrained to dwell several months in that Highland castle of Mauprat, after saying that the only provision made for the lodging either of the domestic servants or of the numerous herd of retainers, was a quantity of straw spread overnight on the floors of the four lower rooms of the tower-like structure, thus continues: "Sometimes about 400 persons, attending this petty court, were kennelled here, and I have heard the same worthy man [Ferguson], from whose lips the exact account of what is here related has been taken, declare that of those wretched dependants he has seen, in consequence of the then existing right of heritable jurisdiction, three or four, and sometimes half-a-dozen, hung up by the heels for hours on the few trees round the mansion."[1] It appears, then, that Shakespeare fell short of the truth when he made Macbeth say, "Upon the next tree shalt thou hang alive till famine cling thee," since if the victims were hung up by the heels, suffocation or apoplexy would settle the matter before famine had time to step in. What the Highland chiefs were in reality, notwithstanding a thin lacker of French polish smeared over the full-dress side of their natures, is abundantly shown even by Sir Walter Scott himself, while he was striving to render them objects of romantic interest. When Waverley saw Fergus MacIvor in one of his fits of passion, with the veins of his forehead swelled, his nostril dilated, his cheek and eye inflamed, and his look that of a demoniac, Evan Maccombich, his Highland ancient, only observed with great composure, "he usually lets blood for these fits," meaning that he vented his savage anger by the effusion, not of his own blood, but of that of some of his wretched Highland serfs. Some of the Highland chiefs were also great borrowers from those who

[1] King's Munimenta Antiqua, iii. 176.

were in their power; and woe to the man who ever reminded them of a debt. He soon disappeared, and was never more heard of. He was either kidnapped, sold, and shipped to America, the West Indies, or the continent of Europe; or if the kidnapping proved difficult, there was the oubliette, the drowning-pot, or the gallows-hill.[1]

From all this an idea may be formed of what sort of government, and what sort of life, the people of England would have been likely to enjoy, if by the ultimate success of Montrose's enterprise, those Highland leaders, by whose assistance that success had been attained, should have obtained the means of introducing some of the blessings of their patriarchal government among the before free people of England. Such an event would have thrown back English civilisation a thousand years.

[1] Burt's Letters from the North of Scotland, i. 48, 49. Edition, London, 1815. Culloden Papers, pp. 118, 119; and Lovat Documents, quoted by Mr. Hill Burton in his "Life of Lord Lovat," p. 169. Jacobite Correspondence of the Athol Family, cited Burton's "Life of Lord Lovat," pp. 151, 152. The Highlands of Scotland described, MS., Royal Library, British Museum, cited ibid., pp. 160, 161. And that the nature of the justice "according to law" administered in the king's courts in Scotland was quite in harmony with that administered by the lords of regality within their respective jurisdictions, is abundantly proved by that valuable publication, "Pitcairn's Criminal Trials in Scotland." 3 vols. 4to. Edinburgh, 1833. It is rather late now to repudiate Burt as an authority, when Sir Walter Scott, Mr. Skene, and Mr. Hill Burton have all recognised him as a great authority. Sir Walter Scott has relied on him so much that his descriptions have evidently formed the groundwork of many of the scenes in "Waverley." Scott has indeed shaded the coarser features out of the pictures. But while in many places he has manifestly copied from Burt (as, for instance, in the description of the dinner in Fergus MacIvor's castle, where he, however, omits what was necessary to make the picture a true picture); in others he has expressly cited him as an authority, as in the notes to the "Lady of the Lake," and in note (9) in vol. ix. p. 20, of his edition of Dryden's Works. The Highlanders of the present day need no more be angry with an Englishman like Burt for saying that when he visited them 150 years ago they were not cleanly in their habits, than the English of the present day need be angry with Erasmus because when he visited them 300 years ago he found them as far behind the Dutch of his time in cleanliness as the Highlanders were behind the English of Burt's time.

The state of the Scottish Highlands at that time—and in that state it had remained for centuries, for the law of progress did not operate on that state of society which had about it a sort of Asiatic immutability—in some respects resembled the state of Greece in the Homeric description. Mr. Grote[1] says the Phenician traders were convenient to enable a Greek chief to turn his captives to account, and to get rid of slaves or friendless Thetes (freemen) who were troublesome. When Poseidon and Apollo ask of Laomedon the stipulated wages of their labour, at the expiration of their time of servitude, he threatens to cut off their ears and send them off to some distant islands.[2] At a distance of 3000 years we find Laomedon, under another name, playing the same game in the neighbourhood of Inverness which he had played at the building of the walls of Troy; and—for he will live as long as the world lasts—he will be found playing it somewhere else 3000 years later.

I honour the Highlanders for their hardihood, bravery, and fidelity to their chiefs, and they can have no great ground of complaint, if I do not honour those chiefs for repaying their bravery and fidelity with savage cruelty at one time, with expulsion from their homes at another. How such men will fight when treated like men and not like beasts, the annals of Great Britain for the last century sufficiently demonstrate. How they fought even when treated worse than beasts are treated by men of common humanity, was shown in the rebellion of 1745; and the Scottish regiment that fought best at the battle of Dunbar was a regiment of Highlanders.[3] I admit also to the full

[1] History of Greece, ii. 140.

[2] Iliad., xxi. 454, 455. Compare xxiv. 752. Odyss. xx. 383; xviii. 83.

[3] Gumble's Life of General Monk, p. 38.

extent the greatness of the military genius of Montrose, which in some respects was perhaps superior to that of Cromwell, insomuch that had Montrose commanded at Dunbar and Worcester, and not been overruled by incapable men, the results of those battles might possibly have been different. At the same time, such were the untiring energy and unerring instinct for doing the right thing at the right time of Cromwell, and such were the discipline, the enthusiasm, and the valour of his troops, that the success of Montrose, if opposed to him, though Montrose had wielded the whole strength of the Cavaliers, the Presbyterians, and the Highland clans united, would at best have been very doubtful; while of ultimate success at the head of the Highland clans alone he would have had no chance whatever. But the supposition that Montrose would not have been overruled by incapable men is one that would never have been realised. There is nothing more difficult than to convince men who claim a descent from men who have shown talent for war that they do not inherit such talent. No consideration, therefore, would have deterred such men as the King, as Argyle, and others from rendering Montrose's military genius useless. The interference of the like ruinous incapacity on the ground of hereditary claims in the conduct of the armies of the Parliament of England was only put a stop to by the self-denying Ordinance. And there was no power to pass such an ordinance either in the mongrel Parliament at Oxford, or in the oligarchical convention of Estates (called a Parliament) at Edinburgh.

Several years before 1644 schemes had been agitated by some of the same parties who favoured and as-

sisted Montrose in 1644. There is a letter[1] from the Queen Henrietta Maria to Wentworth in 1638, which shows that she was then in confidential communication with Randolph Macdonnell, Earl of Antrim, a Papist; who appears to have laid claim, as representative of the Lords of the Isles, to certain parts of the Highlands and Isles then held by the Argyle family; though in a letter to Wentworth, in the preceding page of the same collection, dated "Inverrarey, 9th October 1638," the Lord Lorne says, "This people can hardly be brought back one step to Rome, which, on so good grounds, they have cast off and settled by their laws."[2] And King Charles, in a letter to Wentworth dated York, April 11, 1639, says, "Wentworth, to ease my pains at this time (having very much business) I have commanded Henry Vane to make you full answer to yours of the 1st and 2d of April. Only I will say this, that if it be possible, it is most fit that Antrim be set upon Argyle, and I shall no ways despair of the success, so that you lead the design, whereof I find him most desirous. Therefore I desire you not to shun it, but to assist him all you can in it. So referring you to Mr. Treasurer, I rest your assured friend, Charles R."[3]

Sir Henry Vane, in his letter to Wentworth referred to in the King's letter, and accompanying it, says:—"His Majesty hath commanded me to let you know, that he of late having had instances made unto him by Antrim, and offers to infest Argyle in his country, thinks the time to be proper now to pass his Lordship a commission under the great seal of Ireland for the raising of forces, with power to transport them into Scotland, so as you will be

[1] Strafford's Letters and Despatches, ii. 221. The letter is in French, and is signed "Henriette Marie, R."

[2] Ibid., ii. 220.

[3] Ibid., ii. 318.

pleased to take into your care the managing of the design; for without that, his Majesty having well weighed your Lordship's despatches, as well to himself as Mr. Secretary Windebanke, cannot frame any success of that Lord's undertaking unless you will patronise the same. In confidence whereof I send your Lordship his Majesty's letter to Antrim; in which he is graciously pleased to declare himself unto him, that if he will put over 3000 or 4000 men into Argyle's country, or any other of the Covenanters, he hath given your Lordship order to give him powers and assistance, that is, at his own charge; and whatever land he can conquer from them, he having pretence of right, he shall have the same."[1]

The nature and extent of the claim of the Earl of Antrim on the possessions of the Argyle family will be seen from these words in a letter from him to Wentworth, dated "York House, July 17, 1638:"—"The Lord of Lorne, who possesses part of my predecessor's lands (being the nearest parts of Scotland to Ireland), is providing men and arms with all the power he has, which he says and gives out is to encounter me. This man is my enemy."[2] It would appear that the King still considered Antrim's scheme worth support, notwithstanding the unfavourable view of it contained in Wentworth's letter to Secretary Windebank of 20th March 1638. In that letter Wentworth says:—"I desired to know what provision of victual his Lordship had thought of, which for so great a number of men would require a great sum of money?

[1] Strafford's Letters and Despatches, ii. 319. The words "pretence of right" show a prudent caution as to any decided opinion on a question, the difficulty of which may be seen from Sir Walter Scott's long note on "The Lord of the Isles"—Note vii. of the notes to Canto I. of his poem with that title.

[2] Ibid., ii. 184.

His Lordship said, he had not made any at all, in regard he conceived they should find sufficient in the enemy's country to sustain them, only his Lordship proposed to transport over with him 10,000 live cows to furnish them with milk, which he affirmed had been his grandfather's (Tyrone's) play."[1] That this scheme of the 10,000 cows was not so absurd as it may have appeared to Wentworth, appears from a passage in "Ludlow's Memoirs," where it is stated that the rebels in Connaught and Ulster, "finding themselves surprised, retreated to the bogs; but were pursued by our men, who killed and wounded about 300 of them, in which number were thirty officers, and took from them seven or eight thousand cows, upon whose milk they chiefly subsisted."[2] Wentworth urged many objections to the practicability of Antrim's scheme. First, he said, "in case (as was most likely) the Earl of Argyle should draw all the cattle and corn into places of strength, and lay the remainder waste, how would he in so bare a country feed either his men, his horses, or his cows?"[3] That Wentworth's opinion was altogether unfavourable to Antrim's scheme is clear from this passage towards the end of this long despatch to Secretary Windebank:—"What dishonour it would be to the King's service, what a heartening and encouragement to the ill-affected, if this action should miscarry, or prove fruitless, as I confidently believe it will, if not put into other hands than these that now assume it!"[4]

There is further light thrown on the nature of the zeal of the Earl of Antrim, for the cause of the Stuart king, in another letter from him to Wentworth, dated Dublin, 16th May 1639, in which he says:—"There are come over with

[1] Strafford's Letters and Despatches, ii. 301.
[2] Ludlow's Memoirs, i. 412. 2d edition. London, 1721.
[3] Strafford's Letters and Despatches, ii. 302.
[4] Ibid., ii. 304.

my cousin Sir Donnell Gorme, and out of Kintire and Ila, a hundred gentlemen at the least of my name,[1] besides their servants, and of all sorts there are 300 men or thereabouts; and they coming hither out of their distaste of the Scottishmen's proceedings [in taking their country from them], and to show their fidelity to his Majesty, I could do no less than entertain them, till your Lordship's farther pleasure be known." The words, "to show their fidelity to his Majesty," are words and no more; if he had said, "their hatred to the Campbells," he would have used words that had a meaning. I will give another sentence from the same letter, which shows that Argyle's Highlanders did not in 1639 wear the kilt:—"I assure your Lordship, the Earl of Argyle goes in person to the borders, and all his men clad in red trouse, and all those in Kintire and Ila of my name, that could not escape from him, are also to be sent thither."[2]

In the summer of 1644, Montrose, according to the preconcerted plan, had begun his operations in Scotland. Antrim, who is stated by Burnet to have been a very arrogant as well as a very weak man,[3] and the evidence given above can hardly be said to disprove that statement, had undertaken to send 10,000 Irish into that country; but the number which actually arrived was very much below that amount, being, according to Wishart, not above 1100, according to others, 1600. As Montrose's panegyrists have been supposed to diminish his numbers to make his exploits appear greater, it is difficult, if not impossible, to obtain correct statements of the amount of his forces.

[1] It would appear from the way in which he writes this word "Donnell," as well as his own name, Macdonnell, that Donnell and Donald were the same name, except as to spelling.

[2] Strafford's Letters and Despatches, ii. 339, 340.

[3] Burnet's Hist., i. 72.

Before the arrival of the Irish, Montrose, having entered Scotland, had occupied Dumfries with a few troops. But finding himself in danger of being overpowered by very superior numbers, he returned to Carlisle. He then prepared for another attempt. In disguise, and accompanied by only two attendants, he again entered Scotland, and reached the house of a relation in Strathearn, at the foot of the Grampians. Having despatched his attendants in quest of intelligence, he stayed there some days, passing his time through the night in a little obscure cottage, and in the daytime in the neighbouring mountains alone. Bad news soon reached him. The Marquis of Huntly had taken arms and been defeated, while Gordon of Haddo was made prisoner, and condemned and executed by order of the Scottish Parliament.

In the mountains a report prevailed among the shepherds, that a body of Irish had landed in the north of Scotland and were marching through the Highlands. These proved to be some part of the Irish auxiliaries whom the Earl of Antrim had engaged to send him. They were under the command of Alexander or Alaster Macdonald, by birth a Scottish Islesman, related to the Earl of Antrim. He was called Coll Kittoch or Colkitto, and was a man of great personal strength and courage, but vain and opinionative, and wholly ignorant of regular warfare.[1] Montrose sent orders to him to march

[1] "Yet," says Sir Walter Scott, "such is the predominance of outward personal qualities in the eyes of a wild people, that the feats of strength and courage shown by this champion seem to have made a stronger impression upon the minds of the Highlanders, than the military skill and chivalrous spirit of the great Marquis of Montrose. Numerous traditions are still preserved in the Highland glens concerning Alister M'Donnell, though the name of Montrose is rarely mentioned among them."—Legend of Montrose, chap. xv. Sir Walter Scott says in his "History of Scotland," contained in "Tales of a Grandfather" (i. 431), that he was called Colkitto from his being left handed.

with all expedition into the district of Athole, and despatched messengers to raise the gentlemen of that country in arms, as they were generally well affected to the King's cause. He himself set out on foot in a Highland dress, accompanied only by his cousin, Patrick Graham of Inchbrakie, as his guide, and joined them so unexpectedly that the Irish could hardly be persuaded that the man they saw was the Earl [1] of Montrose, till the respect shown him by the Athole men and others who recognised his person convinced them of their mistake. He came just in time when a prompt and fertile genius like his was needed to save them from destruction. For Argyle was in their rear with a strong force, and the vessels that brought them over had been burnt by him to prevent their escape; the low country was all in arms to resist their coming down into the plains; and the Athole men refused to join them, as they were strangers, apparently without any authority from the King, and not commanded by any person of sufficient rank to be regarded with respect by the Highland chiefs, who considered birth and rank as indispensable to a commander whom they were to obey.

Montrose having been joined by about 800 Athole men, instantly commenced his march towards Strathearn and crossed the Tay. He was soon after reinforced by a body of about 500 men, commanded by two of

But some writers mention him as Alaster M'Donald of Coll-Kettoch, and Sir James Turner in his Memoirs speaks of Alaster Macdonald's "old father, commonly called Coll-Kettoch," or "Coll-Kittuch." And afterwards he calls him "the old man Coll." So that the name, if not a territorial name, would at least appear to have been a patronymic. It will be observed that Sir Walter spells the word "Alister" in one place, and "Alaster" in another. Which is correct, I cannot say.

[1] He was not created Marquis of Montrose till after his victory of Kilsyth.

his friends, Lord Kinpont,[1] eldest son of the Earl of Menteith, of the family of Graham, and a relation of Montrose, and by Sir John Drummond, son to the Earl of Perth, likewise a relation of Montrose. They had been summoned by the Covenanters to assist them against the Irish, as public enemies; but on learning that the Irish were there under Montrose's command, for the King's service, they immediately joined them. Montrose was informed by them that a large body of the enemy was waiting at Perth to attack him as he came down from Athole. As he knew that Argyle and his army were following him close, to prevent his being hemmed in between these two armies, he resolved to march directly to Perth, and either force the enemy to an engagement or take the town. When he came within three miles of Perth he found the enemy, on the 1st of September 1644, drawn up in good order upon a large plain called Tippermuir. They were commanded by Lord Elcho, and were nearly double Montrose's army in number, amounting to 6000 foot and 700 horse.[2] They had cannon also, while Montrose had no cannon and only three horses in his army, of which two were for his own saddle, and the third for Sir William Rollock, who was somewhat lame.[3] It is said that the Highlanders under Montrose were so deeply imbued with the superstitious notion that the party which first shed blood would be victorious, that on the morning of the battle of Tippermuir they murdered a defenceless herdsman,

[1] This name should, it seems, be "Kinpont," not Kilpont, as Wishart and others spell it. See Craik's Romance of the Peerage, iii. 388.

[2] In the "Legend of Montrose" it is called "a body of six thousand infantry and six or seven thousand cavalry." This is surely a misprint for "six or seven hundred cavalry." Even Wishart only says "six thousand foot and seven hundred horse."—Wishart, p. 76. Edinburgh, 1819.

[3] Wishart, p. 77.

whom they found in the fields, by way of securing this advantage.[1]

The advantage which the Lowlanders, from the superiority of their arms and discipline, had in former times enjoyed over the Highlanders no longer existed. Formerly the Scottish infantry formed a compact body, armed with long spears, impenetrable even to the men-at-arms or cavalry of the age, and much more so to Highland infantry.[2] When the musket was first introduced, its importance was very much overrated; for as it was not for a long time effectively combined with the bayonet, it was of no use except as a firearm. An exaggerated notion was also entertained of its powers as a firearm, which were long very small, partly from its weight, and partly from the slow and clumsy machinery for discharging it.[3] Although the use of cartridges had been introduced by Gustavus Adolphus, they were not generally adopted for about a century after his time. The ball being put loose into the gun, it is evident that there was a risk of its falling out before the gun was fired, if the barrel was held in a position below the horizontal. This circumstance appears from the fact of one of the usual articles of the surrender of a place during this war, when the besieged were to march out on

[1] Sir Walter Scott's notes to the "Lady of the Lake."

[2] Mr. Skene (Highlanders of Scotland, i. 235 *et seq.*) has cited many authorities to show that the Highlanders were not the naked and defenceless soldiers in the sixteenth century which they have been represented as being, but that they were well acquainted with the use of defensive armour, and that the steel headpiece, or bonnet, and the habergeon, or the shirt of mail, reaching almost to their heels, were in general use among them. But it is observable that Mr. Skene adduces no authority of later date than 1612. And I have not happened to meet with any authority that the Highlanders engaged in the civil wars of the seventeenth century were supplied with any such defensive armour as the shirt of mail above mentioned.

[3] Lord Herbert of Cherbury, a man of military experience, who wrote in the time of James I., asserts that at that time good archers would do more execution than infantry armed with muskets.

terms, being that the garrison should march out with "matches lighted at both ends, and ball in their mouths."[1] The "ball in the mouth" points to the nonuse of cartridges, and to the balls being put loose into the gun, in which case the mouth was found a convenient magazine. The consequence was, that this exaggerated notion of the powers of the musket without the use of cartridges or the aid of the bayonet, and the composing a regiment of infantry of two-thirds of musketeers and one-third of pikemen, led to great practical disadvantages, for the pikemen were really at that time by far the most efficient part of a regiment of infantry. And even under Gustavus Adolphus, notwithstanding the use of cartridges, we find that the Scotch brigade did their most effective work by the club or butt-end of their muskets. The disadvantages above described were increased by the introduction of a complicated and elaborate system of discipline, combining a variety of words of command with corresponding operations and manœuvres, the neglect of any one of which was sure to throw the whole into confusion. The Scottish Lowland militia thus laboured under a double disadvantage when opposed to Highlanders, having neither their old weapon the spear or pike, nor the modern bayonet, and being subjected to a new and complicated system of discipline which hampered them and cramped all their movements. But this is not all, for we have seen that the London militia at Newbury and elsewhere behaved as well as the best veteran troops. It may therefore be inferred that the Scottish militia was neither so well supplied with pikes nor so well trained in the use of them as the London-trained bands

[1] See the articles of surrender of the castle and garrison of Ragland in Sprigge's "Anglia Rediviva." London, 1647. The same fact appears in the surrender of the castle of Edinburgh to Cromwell in 1650.

regularly exercised in their artillery-ground. On the other hand, the Highlanders' mode of fighting united any advantages to be derived from firearms with those of their ancient habits; for having discharged their firearms, they threw them down, and drawing their broadswords, rushed furiously on enemies who had no effective defence against their attack. But the Highlanders' assault would have been by no means so successful against such a rampart of pikes as that which at Newbury repelled the repeated charges of Rupert and his best cavalry.

Montrose showed that he perfectly understood and knew how to avail himself of all these circumstances. He placed the Irish, who though used to the musket were unarmed with pikes,[1] and therefore unable to resist cavalry, in the centre, and the Highlanders on the flanks. After a skirmish with the cavalry of his opponents, who were beaten off, he charged with the Highlanders, under a heavy fire from his Irish musketeers. They burst into the ranks of the enemy with irresistible fury, and soon put them to flight. The swift-footed Highlanders did great execution in the pursuit. Baillie informs us that a great many burgesses were killed, that "many were bursten in the flight, and died without stroke."[2] According to Wishart, the number of the slain on the part of the Covenanters was computed to be about 2000, and many more were

[1] Wishart, p. 78, says that the Irish had neither pikes nor swords.

[2] Baillie's Letters, ii. 92, old edition. The relative condition of the Scottish Lowlanders at that time, as compared with that of the Highlanders, bore some resemblance to that of the Athenians at the battle of Chæroneia, as compared with that of the Macedonians. The Athenians of that time had relaxed their ancient military training, and were generally averse to military service, while the Macedonians possessed all the qualities of warlike barbarians improved by a high state of military discipline, with all the advantages of strategy which their able leader Philip had learned from Epaminondas. "The Athenian hoplites could not endure fatigue and prolonged struggle like the trained veterans in the opposite ranks."—Grote's History of Greece, xi. 691.

taken prisoners.[1] Montrose's loss was very small. Perth surrendered[2] to him the same day, and then, as he plundered the town, though Wishart asserts that he did not commit the smallest hostility, he supplied his troops with clothing and additional arms. The Earl of Airlie and two of his sons now joined him; and as Argyle, whose army had been augmented by a considerable body of cavalry, was approaching, Montrose, both to avoid him and join with the Gordons, marched suddenly on Aberdeen; with an army, however, considerably reduced in numbers, for many of the Highlanders, according to their custom, which no general at that time was able to abolish, had returned home to their own districts, to lodge their booty in safety and get in their harvest. It appears, nevertheless, from the authority of Spalding, that Montrose, when he reached the Bridge of Dee, near Aberdeen, had still a considerable body of Highlanders in his army.

Montrose having taken possession of the Bridge of Dee, the principal approach to Aberdeen from the south, found the enemy drawn up in order of battle between the Bridge of Dee and the city, under the command of Lord Burleigh, who had with him 2000 foot and 500 horse. Montrose's

[1] Wishart, p. 81.

[2] Some of the reasons for the surrender given in a letter from the ministers of the town show, as Sir Walter Scott has observed, how much the people of the Lowlands had at that time degenerated in point of military courage. The second reason is, that the citizens had concealed themselves in cellars and vaults, where they lay panting in vain endeavours to recover the breath which they had wasted in their retreat, scarcely finding words enough to tell the provost "that their hearts were away, and that they would fight no more though they should be killed." The third reason is, that if the citizens had had the inclination to stand out, they had no means of resistance, most of them having flung away their weapons in their flight. Finally, their courage was overpowered by the sight of the enemy, drawn up like so many wild hounds before the gates of the town, their hands deeply dyed in the blood recently shed, and demanding with hideous cries to be led to further slaughter.

army was now reduced to 1500 foot and 44 horse. Finding himself so much inferior in horse, he intermingled with his cavalry some of his musketeers who could keep up with his horse in speed. The enemy's cavalry having made an attack on those of Montrose, his mingled musketeers and cavalry repulsed them and threw them into confusion. Montrose then moved his small body of mingled cavalry and musketeers to the other wing of his army, and there also encountered and defeated the horse of the Covenanters. In the meantime the two bodies of infantry cannonaded each other, for Montrose had with him the guns which he had taken at Tippermuir. Montrose then charging the enemy, routed them, and pursued them into the town, his men, says Spalding, cutting down all manner of men they could overtake within the town, upon the streets, or in their houses and round about the town. Seeing a man well clad, they would first strip off his clothes that they might not be spoiled with blood, and then kill the man.[1]

When they had entered the town, Montrose returned to the body of his army, which had encamped at "Two-mile Cross," leaving these barbarians at their work of murdering men, dishonouring women, and collecting plunder for four days—namely, Friday, Saturday, Sunday, and Monday—"and nothing heard but pitiful howling, crying, weeping, mourning, through all the streets."[2] It is said that he had promised to his troops the plundering of the town for their good service. "The men they killed they would

[1] Spalding's History, ii. 264, 265. Edinburgh, 1829. Bannatyne Club. It is important to remark that Spalding, a contemporary inhabitant of Aberdeen, being clerk to the consistorial court of the diocese of Aberdeen, was most firmly attached to Charles and Episcopacy, and a wellwisher to the general success of Montrose.

[2] Ibid.

not suffer to be buried, but left their naked bodies lying above ground. The wife durst not cry nor weep at her husband's slaughter before her eyes, nor the mother for her son, nor daughter for her father; which if they were heard, then were they presently slain also."[1] There were other atrocities committed on the women and children. Upon Saturday Montrose came into the town accompanied by the Earl of Airlie, his son Sir Thomas Ogilvy, Sir John Drummond, son to the Earl of Perth, Graham of Fintray, and others. And he actually stayed Saturday, Sunday, and Monday in Aberdeen, "the cruel Irishis[2] still killing and robbing all the while." Montrose declared that he had never shed blood except in battle. But the facts are proved by Spalding, a townsman of Aberdeen, present on the occasion, who was strongly attached to "Church and King," and a well-wisher to Montrose and his cause; consequently, in this case, an unwilling witness, whose testimony may therefore be considered as conclusive. Montrose's chaplain, Bishop Wishart, has passed over in total silence those four days of September 1644, including that Sunday, the 15th of September, when the fate of Aberdeen was like that of Zutphen on a Sunday seventy-two years before; when there was neither preaching nor praying in Aberdeen, and nothing but the death groans of men and the shrieks of women, and when the king's lieutenant could not enter or leave his quarters, in Skipper Anderson's house, without treading on the bloody corpses of those

[1] Spalding's History, ii. 264, 265.

[2] Ibid., ii. 266. Spalding uses this word to comprehend both the Irish and the Highlanders. In the Lowlands of Scotland the language spoken by the Highlanders is called Erse, or Ershe, or Irish. The Highlanders of those days, very unlike their descendants in these, appear to have been, if very superior to sepoys in valour, not much superior in humanity.

not slain in battle, and over streets slippery with innocent blood.

Let us see if anything can be said on the other side. On Friday the 13th of September 1644, the day of the fight at Aberdeen, Montrose sent a drummer and a commissioner to deliver a letter commanding them to render the town to His Majesty's lieutenant, and promising that no more harm should be done to the town, but to take their entertainment for that night, otherwise, if they disobeyed, that then he desired them to remove all aged men, women, and children out of the way, and to stand to their own peril. Their answer was to stand out. They made the commissioner and drummer drink largely, and by the way the drummer was unhappily slain; at which Montrose, "finding his drummer, against the laws of nations, most inhumanely slain, grew mad, and became furious and impatient, charging his men to kill, and pardon none."[1] Now, if this provocation could be any excuse for Montrose's refusing quarter in the fight, and even on first entering the town—and it could not even be any excuse for that in the case of women and men not in arms—it could be none whatever for keeping up this abominable and inhuman proceeding for four days, he himself for three of the days, with his principal officers, being present, and able to stop it when he chose. This is a stain that will stick to his name for ever; and will link it with Aberdeen as the name of Alva is linked with Zutphen, that of Nana Sahib with Cawnpore. On Saturday the 14th of September he had ordered the main body of his army to march forward to Kintore and Inverury; but it was not till Monday the 16th that the soldiers who had stayed behind, rifling and spoiling Aberdeen, were charged

[1] Spalding's History, ii. 264.

by tuck of drum to remove and follow the camp under pain of death. So that it is clear he could have stopped the sack sooner if he had liked. On Monday, before he went out, he gave orders for burying the bodies. But such appears to have been his negligence in regard to discipline, that many of his savages stayed behind after he was gone, "rifling and spoiling both Old and New Aberdeen pitifully."[1]

It may be affirmed that though the number of massacres of unarmed human beings perpetrated by those demons in the shape of men, the Spanish soldiery of Alva, on the people of the Netherlands exceeded the number of such massacres perpetrated by the demons let loose by King Charles and his lieutenant Montrose upon the people of Scotland, there was no massacre perpetrated by Alva which exceeded in circumstances of atrocity and wickedness this Aberdeen massacre. Let this be remembered when there arises the question of the chief criminals, King Charles and his lieutenant Montrose, and then we may well suppose that the cry of innocent blood shed for the purpose of perpetuating tyranny would be heard by the avenger of blood, and that he might say, "Place these two men in my power, and if they escape, Heaven forgive them too!" Charles's trial, though it proved that those who brought him to a public trial were determined not to follow the example of the crowned assassins of other times, was a mistake. There was no law under which he could be tried. But he was a prisoner of war who deserved death as a public enemy, and as the employer of him who perpetrated the Aberdeen massacre.

Spalding describes the conduct of Montrose's major-general M'Donald, who came to Aberdeen for a day on

[1] Spalding, ii. 265, 266.

the following 16th of March, as in strong contrast with that of Montrose in September preceding. He quartered all his foot (700) about the Bridge of Dee and Two-mile Cross, entered the town with only a body of horse, and paid for all "extraordinaries beyond their diet, which indeed they took." When he went, "a number of the Irishis rogues lay lurking behind, abusing and frightening the towns-people, taking their cloaks, plaids, and purses from them on the high street." Stables also were broken open in the night and the horses taken out. M'Donald hearing of this, returned and "called all these rascals with sore skins before him; and so Aberdeen was free both of him and them, by God's providence." Yet he levied a considerable amount in cloth and other commodities for clothing to his soldiers, and made the town come under an obligation to pay the merchants, by laying on a taxation to that effect, which, adds Spalding, they were glad to do to be quit of their company.[1] This was what Montrose, if he had been a man of common humanity, or even had had a due regard for that reputation, that fame of which he professed to be so greedy, and for that glory of which he pretended to be such a worshipper, might and should have done.

For four days, as I have said, did this monstrous cruelty continue, and it would probably have continued till there was not an inhabitant of Aberdeen left alive;[2] for it ceased then only because the approach of Argyle obliged Mon-

[1] Spalding, ii. 305, 306.

[2] It distinctly appears from the statement of Spalding that there was no slackening in the work of butchery. Each of Montrose's followers, he says, "had in his cap or bonnet ane rip of oatis which was his sign. Our towns-people began to wear the like in their bonnets, and to knit to the knockers of our yettis [gates or doors] the like rip of oatis; but it was little safeguard to us, albeit we used the same for a protection."—Spalding's Hist., ii. 266.

trose to evacuate the town. If Cromwell or one of his captains had led the army advancing against Montrose and the brutal savages he led, the speedy result would probably have been such as to gratify in the reader that impulse of indignant revenge which the mere recital of such revolting barbarities naturally excites. But Argyle, though the head of a family and name fertile in brave men, continued following Montrose with a superior army, but without overtaking him, and, it has been said, with no very anxious desire to overtake him. Montrose retreated northward in the hope of being joined by the Gordons; but in this he was disappointed, for, like Strafford, he appears to have had a peculiar knack of making himself deadly personal enemies on all hands, and when he was a zealous promoter of the Covenant he had used great severities towards the opposite party, of which the Marquis of Huntly, head of the Gordons, was one of the chiefs. Spalding mentions many particulars which must have inspired Lord Huntly with irreconcilable hatred to Montrose, and prevented any hearty co-operation with him. But the jealousy and rivalry which form the weakness of an oligarchy, had also no doubt something to do with Huntly's conduct towards Montrose.

Montrose finding the northern bank of the Spey, the most rapid river in Scotland, guarded by about 5000 men drawn from the adjacent counties, had no resource but retreat to the mountains. Having therefore hid his cannon in a bog and parted with all his heavy baggage, he led his men by skilful marches over the mountains, and thence descended upon Athole. After several long and rapid marches, Montrose recrossing the great chain of the Grampians, returned to Aberdeenshire, and then again to Athole. He was now deserted by many Lowland gentle-

men who had joined him, and who alleged that they were unable to undergo the fatigue of such constant and long marches in the midst of winter over wild uninhabited mountains, which were impassable for rocks and thickets, and always covered with snow. The same circumstances which caused the desertion of Montrose's Lowland followers rendered it impossible for Argyle to keep the field, and sending his army into winter quarters, he returned to his own domains.

About the middle of December Argyle was residing in his castle of Inverary in the most perfect confidence that no enemy could approach him, for he used to say that he would not for 100,000 crowns that any one knew the passes into the country of the Campbells, when he was astounded by the intelligence that Montrose with his army, wading through drifts of snow, scaling precipices, and traversing mountain paths, which he had believed inaccessible to anything in the shape of an army, had broken into Argyleshire, and was laying it waste with fire and sword. He immediately embarked on board a fishing-boat, leaving his friends and followers to their fate. The houses were burnt, the cattle driven off, and the able-bodied men were slaughtered.

The regions traversed on this occasion by Montrose and his Highland army were not only the most rugged and the most difficult to traverse, from the almost inaccessible character of their physical form—apart from the storms and the snow and ice of winter—but they were and are also the most dreary and dismal of the Highlands of Scotland. An attempt has in recent times been made to prove that the impressions produced, some 150 or 200 years ago, on Englishmen such as Burt by such scenery, arose from their bad taste in scenery, or at least from

their standard of taste being Richmond Hill, and their notion of a poetical mountain being a hill "smooth and easy of ascent, clothed with a verdant flowery turf, where shepherds tend their flocks, sitting under the shade of tall poplars."[1] But the fact is that Captain Burt was by no means insensible to either the sublime or the beautiful in Scottish scenery. He saw in the Fall of Foyers as much, and probably more, than many a modern tourist with guide-book in hand teaching him where to burst forth in notes of admiration. He saw "a wild cataract pouring over romantic rocks," and he describes "the side of the hill hid from sight in windy weather by the spray, that looks like a thick body of smoke;" and he adds that "this fall of water has been compared with the cataracts of the Tiber by those who have seen them both."[2] He also appreciated fully the beauty of that region of Scotland which writers of acknowledged taste, Lady Mary Wortley Montague and Sir Walter Scott, have declared to be the most romantic region of every country, that, namely, where the mountains unite themselves with the plains or lowlands. For he speaks of a part of the country of Athole as being "an exception from the preceding gloomy descriptions, as may likewise be some other places not far distant from the borders of the Lowlands, which," he says, "I have not seen."[3] He then describes the strath or vale that lies along the banks of the Tay as presenting the most romantic and beautiful combination of mountain, water, and wood—the strath most beautifully adorned with plantations of various sorts of trees—in one part the ride through pleasant glades, in another through corn-

[1] Burt's Letters from the North of Scotland, ii. 13. New edition. London, 1815.

[2] Ibid., ii. 71.

[3] Ibid., ii. 61.

fields—then the ascent of a small height "from whence you have a pleasing variety of that wild and spacious river, woods, fields, and neighbouring mountains, which altogether give a greater pleasure than the most romantic description in words, heightened by a lively imagination, can possibly do." The next sentence affords the explanation of what has been erected of late into an astounding paradox. "But the satisfaction seemed beyond expression, by comparing it in our minds with the rugged ways and horrid prospects of the more northern mountains, when we passed southward from them, through this vale to the low country."[1]

Now, so far is Captain Burt's impression of much of this Highland scenery from being a startling paradox, that it is precisely the impression produced even in Scotchmen of education and cultivated taste in the year 1861. In a paper in "Macmillan's Magazine" for October 1861, entitled "From London to Ballachulish and back," and evidently written not by a native Londoner but by a Scotchman, the writer thus describes his walk of ten miles from Inveroran Inn, through the Marquis of Breadalbane's deer-forest of Blackmount, to King's House Inn: "Forest is the name; but, save some plantings near Loch Tolla, all consists of bleak, black hills, among which the deer manage somehow. Hill-satiated as we should have supposed ourselves to be, there was in the dreariness, all along the road, ever some new combination of the few simple features of mountain, glen, cairn, gully, and small moor-girt lake, to interrupt the monotony of the impression, and convince us how much more various and subtle are the strokes and shadows of nature on our minds, in any one of its expanses, than are our resources of language

[1] Burt's Letters from the North of Scotland, ii. 62.

in characterising them. It was on our right that the view was dreariest; for here, as I have found from the guide-books since, we were, without knowing it, on the verge of the great moor of Rannoch, 'a track of twenty-eight miles by sixteen, with a mean elevation of about 1000 feet above the level of the sea, chiefly a wild waste, the largest and dreariest moor in Scotland.' According to the same authority, the western part of this moor 'lies well under the eye in the road from Loch Tolla to King's House; and this part contains the flat, sinuous, repulsive Loch Lydoch, seven miles long and about a mile broad, and is, all else, a mixture of bog, heath, and rock, hideous and dismal, without life or feature, environed in the far distance by coarse, dark mountains.' I confess to a kind of dread, dull affection for the Stygian tract, thus outcast of the guide-books, which I saw without knowing its name, though the 'repulsive loch' began its leech-like length over the dismal moor at our feet, and the 'coarse, dark mountains' seemed, as we walked, to bound in some realm of ugliness and doom. . . . Never did I, and never did my companion, see a scene so unearthly, so Acherontic. It was getting towards evening; the rain had been with us all day; the whole air around us was charged with vapour; but down in the huge hollow before us the vapour lay in one whitish, semi-transparent sea of mist, in which all things tangible seemed to end, through which there seemed to come disturbing puffs and motions, clearing darker chasms which slowly filled up again, while the boundary behind was a ridge of opaque and formless ground, rising into what might be hills, but holding, as if half up the height of the hills, a chain of glimmering lakes. The ghastliness of the misty hollow, and especially of these glimmering water-islets, hung in the seeming

gloom of hills, was positively appalling. We looked again and again; our pace slackened; we were not as tourists descending a common road to an inn, but as men who had been under a lure into those savage parts, and might now be descending into an Inferno."

Milton returning to England from Italy by Geneva, "must," says one of his biographers, "have been delighted with the lake scenery and Alpine summits of this magnificent country." If Milton was delighted with the Alpine scenery, he did not say so either in prose or verse. The only allusion he has made to the Alpine scenery is where he uses it as an illustration of the scenery of his Hell.[1] It has now become the fashion to be in raptures of admiration of this scenery which Milton passed over without remarking either beauty or grandeur in it. And this could hardly be from the vulgar and prosaic character of Milton's mind; for the very man who brought this scenery into fashion—Lord Byron—has said of Milton, that Time the avenger has made the word Miltonic mean sublime. An instructive chapter might be written from this text on the association of ideas; and some assistance towards the solution of the problem might be obtained from the account given by Bishop Berkeley, like Milton, a man of cultivated mind, of his passage of the Alps some seventy years after Milton passed them. "Savoy," writes Berkeley, in a letter dated Turin, January 6, 1714, N.S., "was a perpetual chain of rocks and mountains almost impassable for ice and snow. And yet I rode post through it, and came off with only four falls," from which I received no

[1] "Through many a dark and dreary vale
They passed, and many a region dolorous—
O'er many a frozen, many a fiery Alp—
Rocks, caves, lakes, fens, bogs, dens, and shades of death."
Paradise Lost, b. ii. vv. 618-620.

other damage than the breaking my sword, my watch, and my snuff-box. On New Year's Day we passed Mount Cenis. We were carried in open chairs by men used to scale these rocks and precipices. My life often depended on a single step."[1] In such circumstances, as Gray remarks in a letter quoted by Lord Macaulay,[2] "the horrors were accompanied with too much danger to give one time to reflect upon the beauties." It is therefore hard upon Burt that he should be censured for preferring the beauties of Richmond Hill to the "sublimities" or "horrible prospects" of the Highlands of Scotland, when Milton, the sublimest of poets, has left no further record of the effect produced on his mind by the "sublimities" or "horrible prospects" of the Alps than his introduction of them into his description of Hell. Such was the sum and substance of Milton's "Swiss Journal:" yet Milton does not say that the scenery was not sublime; but the beauty which later writers have discovered in addition to the sublimity Milton does not appear to have seen. And to those who may say that Milton's standard of beauty in landscape might have been lowered by the bad taste of his age, may be quoted the remark of Walpole, that Milton's Eden is free from the defects of the Old English Garden; and of Dugald Stewart, that Milton in his Garden of Eden has created a landscape more perfect probably in all its parts than has ever been realised in nature, and certainly very

[1] Berkeley's Letters, prefixed to the 1st vol. of his works. London, 1820. Berkeley's wearing a sword, as appears from this extract, might lead to the inference that he was not then in holy orders, were it not that he was then travelling to Italy "in quality," as he says himself in a letter to Pope, dated Leghorn, May 1714, "by the favour of my good friend the Dean of St. Patrick's [Swift], chaplain to the Earl of Peterborough."

[2] Hist. of England, iii. 28, note.

different from anything that this country exhibited at the time when he wrote.[1]

Bishop Wishart says that Argyle first practised this cruel method of waging war against the innocent country-people by fire and devastation, but he gives no proof of his assertion; and he then gravely tells us that Montrose ever afterwards acknowledged that he had never experienced the singular providence and goodness of God in a more remarkable manner than at this time, thus proving that Montrose was a fanatic even in the usual meaning of the word.[2] Montrose having continued his work of destruction and slaughter from about the middle of December 1644 till near the end of January,[3] withdrew towards Inverness. When he had proceeded some way he learned that Argyle had returned into the Western Highlands with some forces from the Lowlands, had assembled his numerous clan, and was lying with a strong force near the old castle of Inverlochy, situated at the western extremity of the chain of lakes through which the Caledonian Canal now passes. Montrose instantly changed his course, and by a succession of the most difficult mountain-passes covered with snow returned upon Argyle, and on the 1st of February Argyle's outposts were slain or driven in. By the time that Montrose's rear came up with the rest of his army, night came on, but it was moonlight, and both sides

[1] Even those who dissented altogether from the school of metaphysics to which Stewart belonged have acknowledged his power as a lecturer. "The idea of Professor Dugald Stewart delivering a lecture, recalls the idea of the delight with which I heard him; that the idea of the studies in which it engaged me; that the trains of thought which succeeded; and each epoch of my mental history, the succeeding one, till the present moment; in which I am endeavouring to present to others what appears to me valuable among the innumerable ideas of which this lengthened train has been composed."—James Mill's Analysis of the Phenomena of the Human Mind, chap. iii. The Association of Ideas.

[2] Wishart, chap. viii. p. 108.

[3] Ibid.

all night stood to their arms, harassing each other with slight sallies and skirmishes, so that neither gave the other time to repose. About the middle of the night Argyle took to a boat, and rowing off-shore, remained at a safe distance on the lake, choosing rather to be a spectator of the valour of his men than to share in the danger himself. Some writers represent Argyle as retreating to his boat on learning that Montrose himself was present with his troops; but according to Wishart, Argyle took the step before he knew it, for part of Montrose's forces being concealed in the gorge of the mountains, the enemy, as the prisoners afterwards acknowledged, did not imagine on the 1st of February that Montrose himself was present, but only one of his principal officers, with a part of his forces.

At break of day on the 2d of February, Montrose drew out his men in order of battle, and the Campbells could distinguish in the gorge of the defile the war-notes of various clans as they advanced to the onset, one of them bearing the ominous words, addressed to the wolves and ravens, "Come to me, and I will give you flesh." At length about sunrise Montrose's trumpets sounding from the gorge of the pass, in that note with which it was the ancient Scottish fashion to salute the royal standard, at once convinced the enemy that Montrose commanded in person, and, as it was the signal of horse, also led them to believe that he had some troops of horse with him. "Nevertheless," adds Wishart, "the chiefs of the Campbells (that is the surname of Argyle's family and clan), who were indeed a set of very brave men, and worthy of a better chieftain and a better cause, began the battle with very great courage."[1] Argyle's forces consisted altogether of about 3000 men. A considerable portion of these being composed of such

[1] Wishart, chap. viii. p. 112. Edition, Edinburgh, 1819.

half-trained and ill-armed Lowlanders as I have before described, were divided between the two flanks. The rest, who were Highlanders, and consequently trained and armed as Montrose's Highlanders were, formed the centre. The number of Montrose's force cannot be ascertained, but his furious assault at once broke and scattered the wings composed of such troops; and then the centre being charged on all sides was quickly overthrown, and the whole army routed and pursued for several miles with great slaughter. According to Wishart, there were 1500 of Argyle's forces slain, among whom were several gentlemen of distinction of the name of Campbell, who led on the clan, and fell, adds Wishart, "fighting rather too gallantly for the honour of their dastardly chieftain."[1]

Montrose now resumed his purpose of marching to Inverness, which he expected would surrender to him, as he was now joined by the Gordons and the Grants, who had kept back till they saw the issue of his last battle. But the town, garrisoned by two veteran regiments, was impregnable. Turning, therefore, from it, he let loose the ferocity of his temper as well as that of his troops upon the unprotected country. The towns of Elgin, Cullen, and Banff were plundered. He then advanced farther south, and burnt to ashes the town of Stonehaven. "It is said the people of Stonehaven and Cowie came out, men and women, children at their feet, and children in their arms, crying, howling, and weeping, praying the Earl for God's sake to save them from this fire, how soon it was kindled. But the poor people got no answer, nor knew where to go with their children. Lamentable to see!"[2] Such were the proceedings that were held out by the ministers of Montrose's master as an example to English com-

[1] Wishart, chap. viii. p. 113.

[2] Spalding, ii. 307

manders;[1] and such were the tender mercies of "King Charles the Good." But the people of Scotland were not to be gained over by such means; and Montrose, whatever he might be as a soldier, showed that he was no statesman by resorting to them, and with all his victories, he never obtained a firm footing in Scotland.

The Scottish Parliament now began to be seriously alarmed. They called from the army in England General Baillie, an officer of skill and reputation, and Sir John Urry, or, as the English called him, Hurry, a brave and veteran soldier of fortune, who had changed sides more than once during this war, and was to change sides yet again before he could change no more, perishing by the hands of the executioner for joining the man against whom he was now fighting. These generals, with a body of veteran troops, manœuvred to exclude Montrose from the southern districts, and at the same time the Marquis of Huntly recalled most of the Gordons, and Montrose's cavalry was reduced to 150. He was therefore compelled once more to retire to the mountains, but he resolved first to punish the town of Dundee, which, says Wishart, "was a most seditious place, and a faithful receptacle to the rebels in those parts, having contributed as much as any other town in the kingdom to carry on the rebellion, and was kept at that time by no other garrison than the inhabitants."[2] Accordingly, on the 4th of April appearing suddenly before it with a select body of his troops, he stormed the town in three places at once. The Highlanders and Irish, with their usual fury, forced an entrance. They were dispersing in quest of strong liquor and plunder, and the town would undoubtedly, as Wishart observes, have been soon burnt to the ground,

[1] Clar. State Papers, ii. 89.

[2] Wishart, chap. ix. p. 121.

when Montrose received intelligence that Baillie and Urry with 4000 men were not above a mile distant. The success which attended Montrose's exertions in this emergency to bring off his men, though already "a little heated with liquor, and much taken with the hopes of the rich booty which they already counted all their own," proves that Montrose might if he had chosen have prevented or at least stopped the barbarities at Aberdeen, which would no doubt have been repeated at Dundee but for the timely coming up of Baillie's and Urry's forces. Before Montrose succeeded in bringing all his men off, the enemy were within gunshot of the last of them. He then ordered his retreat in this manner. He first sent off 400 foot, and ordered them to march with all the speed they could without breaking their ranks. He then appointed 200 of his most active and swiftest men to follow them, and he himself with the horse brought up the rear; but he made them march with their ranks so wide as to receive the light musketeers if there should be need. This retreat has been considered as conducted with a degree of skill which established Montrose's military character as much as any of his victories. Such were the hardihood and resolution of his men that they are said to have marched about sixty miles, and to have passed three days and two nights either in marching or fighting, and without either food or sleep.[1]

[1] Wishart, chap. ix.

## CHAPTER XVII.

*THE NEW MODEL OF THE PARLIAMENTARY ARMY—BATTLE OF NASEBY—MONTROSE'S SUCCESS AT AULDERNE, ALFORD, AND KILSYTH—HIS DEFEAT BY DAVID LESLIE AT PHILIPHAUGH—SUCCESSES OF FAIRFAX AND CROMWELL AFTER THE BATTLE OF NASEBY—SURRENDER OF BRISTOL—STORMING OF BASING HOUSE—THE KING'S INTRIGUES THROUGH THE EARL OF GLAMORGAN—END OF THE FIRST WAR—THE KING GOES TO THE SCOTS AT NEWARK, AND IS BY THEM DELIVERED UP TO THE ENGLISH PARLIAMENT — EPISCOPACY ABOLISHED — THE COURT OF WARDS ABOLISHED.*

IN that military system called the New Model, which for complete and effective organisation has never been equalled in the world, the commissariat was managed by military officers, that distinguished soldier Ireton being for a considerable time at the head of it, with the title of Commissary-General. Ireton was succeeded by another of the best of the Parliament's officers, Whalley, colonel of Cromwell's most distinguished cavalry regiment, of which Richard Baxter was for two years chaplain, and which he designates the *Trusted* Regiment. Sir Walter Scott, amid much misrepresentation of Cromwell and the great political party to which he belonged, has in "Woodstock" done justice to the effect of that commissariat on the food and general comfort of the soldiers. Such soldiers as Cromwell's could never have been formed by commanders who neglected their commissariat, and by

consequence those means which were essential to the efficiency of their troops in action.

Sir Walter Scott introduces one of Cromwell's troopers saying to that commander, "Thou shalt eat with joy the food of him that laboureth in the trenches, seeing that since thou wert commander over the host, the poor sentinel hath had such provisions as I have now placed for thine own refreshment." "Truly," said Cromwell, "we would wish that it were so; neither is it our desire to sleep soft, nor feed more highly than the meanest that ranks under our banners."

The English East India Company formed their commissariat on similar principles, with what result is well known. From the time when the genius and valour of Clive turned the tide which was setting in strongly against the English in India, when he held the post of commissary to the troops with the rank of captain, the duties of the Indian commissariat were discharged by regimental officers, captains, or subalterns from the Company's regular forces. This both caused them to be more respected, and secured a greater insight into what was wanted from a commissariat officer than was to be attained by putting the business into the hands of clerks. On a somewhat similar principle military officers were often employed on what might be denominated civil duties without reference to their military rank. Thus a man might be found executing an office somewhat analogous to that of governor of a province, to that of a Roman proconsul, commanding large forces and determining on weighty political measures, who in military rank was only a lieutenant in a Company's regiment. In this manner the Company had the pick of able men; and it could not afford to employ worse, and in this manner it furnished almost the only

examples in modern times of really great men, of men able at once to manage weighty political affairs and to command armies. It remains to be seen whether the abolition of the East India Company's government, and the substitution for it of a government of a very different kind, will produce any more such officers as the long series of soldier-statesmen who have given imperishable lustre to the government of the English East India Company.

On the day before that on which Montrose stormed the town of Dundee—namely, on the 3d of April 1645—the Self-denying Ordinances had been passed by the English Parliament, and the *New Model*, as it was called, was then introduced into the Parliamentary army. The New Model was, in fact, nothing else than the introduction into the management of an army of the same principles and modes or methods of action which all men of practical common sense, or at least all men of practical good sense, employ in the conduct of their ordinary business. The men who had before had the management of the war for the Parliament had, or certainly appeared to have, sought how *not* to do the work entrusted to them. The men now employed, on the other hand, strove to do it—and they did it—and that both well and speedily, setting an example and teaching a lesson to all succeeding ages. The war had now lasted for three winters and two summers, and the Parliament (notwithstanding its one decisive victory of Marston Moor, won not by a peer or a soldier of fortune, but by a plain man of business turned by the times from a gentleman farmer into a colonel of horse) was in a worse condition than when it began. In England, except at Marston Moor, the King seemed to have everywhere the best of it; and in Scotland, Montrose had hitherto marched, and was to march for some months longer, from

victory to victory. And yet such was the effect of simply taking the management of the war out of the hands of incapable and putting it into the hands of capable men, that in less than a year from the time when the New Model was put in operation, the King's forces were everywhere totally defeated and the first civil war was ended.

Sir Thomas Fairfax's commission had been granted on the 1st of April, and on the 3d of April he went from London to Windsor to assist personally in the framing of a new army. This work occupied him to the end of April, the forces that remained of the old army being not only to be recruited, but to be reduced into new companies and regiments, as if they had been new raised.[1] Cromwell had come to Windsor with the avowed purpose of taking leave of the general on laying down his command, according to the Self-denying Ordinance, when the dispensation from Parliament arrived with orders to him to march on a particular service.[2] The new-modelled army was at first regarded at once with distrust by the professed friends of the Parliament, and with contempt by its enemies, who scornfully termed it the *New Nodel*,[3] and promised themselves an easy victory over it. "Never hardly," says May, "did any army go forth to war who had less of the confidence of their own friends, or were more the objects of the contempt of their enemies, and yet who did more bravely deceive the expectations of them both, and show how far it was possible for human conjectures to err. For in their following actions and successes they proved such excellent soldiers, that it would too much pose antiquity, among all the camps of their famed heroes, to find a par-

[1] Sprigge's Anglia Rediviva, p. 9. London, 1647.

[2] Rushworth, vi. 23, 24; Whitelock, p. 141. Sprigge's Anglia Rediviva, pp. 10, 11.

[3] Sprigge's Anglia Rediviva, p. 12.

allel to this army. He that will seriously weigh their achievements in the following year, against potent and gallant enemies, and consider the greatness of the things they accomplished, the number of their victories, how many battles were won, how many towns and garrisons were taken, will hardly be able to believe these to have been the work of one year, or fit to be called one war. But whosoever considers this must take heed that he do not attribute too much to them, but give it wholly to Almighty God, whose Providence over this army, as it did afterwards miraculously appear, so it might in some measure be hoped for at the first, considering the behaviour and discipline of those soldiers. For the usual vices of camps were here restrained; the discipline was strict; no theft, no wantonness, no oaths, nor any profane words, could escape, without the severest castigation; by which it was brought to pass that in this camp, as in a well-ordered city, passage was safe, and commerce free."[1] It will be evident from what has been said that the portion of the old army which had been raised and was commanded by Cromwell, was that upon which the whole of the new army was modelled.

Cromwell having marched immediately on the particular service above mentioned, engaged a part of the King's force near Islip-bridge in Oxfordshire, where he completely routed the Queen's regiment, and three other regiments of horse, slew many, took about 500 horse, 200 prisoners, and the Queen's standard. Most of the fugitives took refuge in Bletchingdon House, which was speedily surrendered to Cromwell. For this surrender, Colonel Windebank, the governor, was tried by court-martial and shot, notwithstanding the great interest his father, Secretary Winde-

[1] May, Breviary.

bank, had at Court for the great service he had done the Church of Rome. Thereupon his brother, a lieutenant-colonel, laid down his commission.[1] Not long after, the governor of Gaunt House, which was difficult of access by reason of the moat, being summoned by Colonel Rainsborough to surrender it, returned a positive refusal, adding that he liked not Windebank's law. Yet he surrendered it the next day, without, however, undergoing the fate of the unfortunate Colonel Windebank.[2] However, Bletchingdon House seems to have been surrendered almost immediately on summons, while Gaunt House was "battered sore all that day" (May 31), and surrendered on the day following. A garrison was then put by the Parliament into Gaunt House, "being a place that was conceived would much conduce to the straitening of Oxford."[3]

At the opening of the campaign Fairfax detached 7000 men to the relief of Taunton, where Blake, who had before so well defended Lyme, was hard pressed by the Royalists. Fairfax having deceived the enemy by his countermarches, so that the besiegers of Taunton imagined his whole force was directed against them and drew off from the siege, proceeded towards Oxford. But Goring, Hopton, and Grenville having joined all their forces together, renewed the siege of Taunton, cooping up in the town the forces sent by Fairfax to its relief. The Scottish army, nominally 21,000, but scarcely 16,000, was ordered to march south and join the forces of the Parliament in Staffordshire, Derbyshire, Yorkshire, Nottinghamshire, and Lincolnshire, besides 2500 horse and dragoons, under Colonel Vermuden, whom Fairfax despatched to join them. This provision

[1] Sprigge's Anglia Rediviva, pp. 11, 12.
[2] Ibid., 22.
[3] Ibid., 27.

was held sufficient in case the King should move northward. On the other hand, in case the King should have moved southward or westward, Fairfax, lying about Oxford,[1] was in a position to fight with him and to hinder his designs. But the Scottish army, instead of marching southward, retreated into Westmoreland, the Scottish oligarchy being much dissatisfied with the New Model, which did not agree with their notions of the management either of an army or a state. The King after relieving Chester had taken by storm Leicester, which his troops plundered and sacked with great inhumanity, and the new-modelled army having met with some slight reverses elsewhere, the state of the Parliament's affairs appeared to become critical, insomuch that the King in a letter to the Queen of June 8th wrote, "I may without being too much sanguine affirm that since this rebellion my affairs were never in so hopeful a way."[2]

On the 8th of June Fairfax called a council of war to consider of the best way to engage the enemy, and he made a proposition to the council, which they unanimously agreed to, that a letter should be written to the Parliament to desire that they would dispense for a time with Lieutenant-General Cromwell's presence in the House, and appoint him to command the horse, it being likely that there would be an engagement very soon. This desire was immediately granted. Skippon was desired to draw the plan of a battle, and Fairfax proceeded

[1] While Fairfax was blockading Oxford he made the following capture, as recorded in a contemporary newspaper:—"Yesterday Sir Thomas took three carts, laden with canary-sack, going to Oxford."—Perfect Diurnal, May 19–26, 1645. In Cromwelliana, p. 16. The Cavaliers were of the opinion of Falstaff as to the virtues of sack. But in this war water proved stronger than sack.

[2] Sprigge's Anglia Rediviva, pp. 15–26. Rush., vi. 27 *et seq.* Whitelock, p. 141 *et seq.*

with all speed to concentrate his forces. On the 12th of June, his army being quartered near Northampton, Fairfax took horse about twelve at night and rode about his lines till four in the morning. Having forgotten the word, he was stopped at the first guard, and requiring the soldier that stood sentinel to give it him, the soldier refused to do it, telling the general he was to demand the word from all that passed him, but to give it to none, and so made the general stand in the wet till he sent for the captain of the guard to receive his commission to give the general the word.

About six in the morning of June 13th a council of war was called. In the midst of the debate came in Lieutenant-General Cromwell with 600 horse and dragoons out of the associated counties, whither he had been sent to put them in a state of defence against an attempt which was threatened by the King's forces.[1] Cromwell was received with the greatest joy by the general and the whole army. Instantly orders were given for the drums to beat and the trumpets to sound to horse. A good party of horse was sent towards Daventry, under the command of Major Harrison, to bring further intelligence of the enemy's movements; another strong party of horse was sent, under the command of Colonel Ireton, to fall upon the flank of the enemy if he saw cause; and the main body of the army marched to flank the enemy on the way to Harborough, and came that night to Gilling; "the country," says the contemporary historian who was present, "much rejoicing at our coming, having been miserably plundered by the enemy; and some having had their children taken from them, and sold before their faces to the Irish of that army, whom the parents were enforced

[1] Sprigge's Anglia Rediviva, p. 32. London, 1647, folio.

to redeem with the price of money."[1] That evening Ireton beat up the enemy's quarters, which they had just taken up in the village of Naseby with a negligence which showed their want of intelligence and slight esteem of the Parliamentary army. Ireton took many prisoners, and upon this alarm the King left his quarters at eleven at night, and for security went to Harborough, where Prince Rupert quartered. A council of war was called, and it was resolved to give battle.

On Saturday the 14th of June Fairfax[2] advanced with his army by three in the morning from Gilling towards Naseby. By five his army was near Naseby, and soon after the army of the enemy being plainly seen advancing in order, Fairfax prepared for battle. The scene of action was a moor situated about three-quarters of a mile to the north of Naseby, flanked on the left hand with a hedge, which Fairfax lined with dragoons to prevent the enemy from annoying his left flank. The country there consists of long low undulations, and the field on which the battle was fought sinks towards the middle, while the south and north extremities of it form long low ridges of rising ground; so that the Parliamentary army occupying the south ridge and the Royalist the north, neither had any advantage of ground. The hollow between the two armies was at that time called Broad Moor. The place was enclosed about fifty years ago. The hedge lined with dragoons still remains as in Sprigge's map. The village of Naseby would also seem to be little if at all

[1] Sprigge's Anglia Rediviva, p. 32. London, 1647.

[2] Here, as at Marston Moor and elsewhere, if the country people of the neighbourhood profess to give any traditional information, it is all absorbed by the name of Cromwell. It is, "Cromwell slept at such a place the night before the battle;" "Cromwell's bones lie in a grave nine feet deep in that field there," &c. &c.

changed since the time of the battle, most of the cottages presenting the same picturesque appearance as in Sprigge's plan of the battle. Fairfax had taken possession of the rising ground on the south side and nearest to the village of Naseby, and had drawn up his army on it, fronting the enemy and facing north-north-east. But considering that it might be of advantage to draw up his army out of sight of the enemy,[1] he retreated about a hundred paces from the brow of the eminence, that the enemy might not perceive in what form his battle was drawn up, while he might recover the advantage of the rising ground when he pleased. The enemy perceiving this retreat, thought Fairfax was drawing off to avoid fighting, and advanced with so much haste that they left some part of their ordnance behind them.

The centre of the King's army was commanded by the King in person; the right wing, consisting of cavalry, was commanded by the Princes Rupert and Maurice; the left wing, also of cavalry, was commanded by Sir Marmaduke Langdale. The Earl of Lindsey, Sir Jacob, now created Lord Astley, and Sir George Lisle, commanded the reserves. The main body of the Parliamentary army was commanded by Fairfax and Skippon; the right wing, consisting of six regiments of horse, was led by Cromwell; the left wing, composed of five regiments of horse, a division of 200 horse of the association, and the dragoons to line the hedge before mentioned, was at

[1] When Bonaparte on the morning of the battle of Waterloo mounted his horse to survey Wellington's position, he could see but few troops. This led him to suppose that Wellington had retreated, leaving only a rear-guard. General Foy, who had served long in Spain, is said to have made this observation, "Wellington never shows his troops; but if he is there, I must warn your Majesty that the English infantry in close combat is the devil (l'infanterie Anglaise en duel c'est le diable)."

Cromwell's request committed to Colonel Ireton, who for that purpose was made commissary-general of horse. The reserves were commanded by Colonels Rainsborough, Hammond, and Pride. The two armies were about equal as to numbers, "there being in that not 500 odds,"[1] or, there not being the difference of 500 men between them. In letters dated June 12 from Fairfax's quarters, his forces are stated to be between 16,000 and 17,000 strong.[2] And the Parliamentary writers state the odds, whether it was 500 or more or less, to have been on the side of the King, "especially in horse, on which they chiefly depended."[3] And indeed the Parliament too throughout these wars depended chiefly on their horse, which, for the reasons I have before mentioned in speaking of Montrose's successes, were at that time a more efficient arm than the foot, with the exception of such foot as Montrose's Highlanders, who did not suffer from the transition state between the discarding of the pike and the invention of the bayonet and cartridge as the other infantry did. The importance attached to the cavalry is shown by the fact, that if Cromwell had not arrived in time, it was said to be the intention of Fairfax to lead the cavalry in person.

Upon the enemy's approach the army of the Parliament marched up to the brow of the rising ground, Fairfax having sent down a forlorn-hope of 300 musketeers somewhat more than a carbine-shot in front, who were ordered to retreat when hard pressed. In the meanwhile the enemy "marched up in good order, a swift march, with a great deal of gallantry and resolution."[4] On the right

[1] Sprigge, p. 40.
[2] Merc. Brit., June 9 to 16, in Cromwelliana, p. 18.
[3] Sprigge, p. 33.
[4] Ibid., p. 35.

wing of the King's army Prince Rupert charged furiously and put to flight the left wing of the Parliament's army opposed to him.

Ireton, seeing one of the enemy's brigades of foot on his right hand pressing hard on the Parliamentary foot, charged that body of foot and fell in among the musketeers, where his horse being shot under him, and himself run through the thigh with a pike and into the face with a halbert, he was taken prisoner, and did not escape till the subsequent turn of the battle. Prince Rupert charged the Parliamentary horse opposed to him, says a contemporary account, "with such gallantry, as few in the army ever saw the like,"[1] and pursuing them almost to the village of Naseby, in his return summoned the train, where Colonel Bartlet's regiment, and the firelocks that guarded the train, repulsed him and kept him engaged till the Royal forces were thrown into confusion in other parts of the field.

On the right wing of the Parliamentary forces Cromwell, after a very gallant resistance by the horse on the left wing of the King's army, completely routed them, and detaching part of his force to keep them from rallying, turned back to the assistance of Fairfax; for in the centre the Parliamentary foot, with the exception of Fairfax's own regiment, had been obliged to fall back in some disorder behind the reserves. But rallying again in a very short time, they, with the aid of the reserves, forced the enemy to a disorderly retreat, with the exception of one *tertia*,[2] which after a desperate

[1] Extract from a letter signed Henry Maud, Weekly Account, June 11 to 18, in Cromwelliana, p. 18.

[2] *Tertias*, "whilk we call regiments," says Captain Dalgetty, speaking of his service with "the Spaniard." The term does not seem to have come into

resistance was at last broken, being charged at the same time by horse and foot. In this charge Fairfax with his own hand killed the ensign who carried the Royal colours. A soldier having seized them, and afterwards boasting that he had himself won that trophy, was reprimanded by Captain D'Oiley of the general's life guard, who had seen the action. "Let him take that honour," said Fairfax, "I have enough besides." Fairfax had lost his helmet in the heat of the battle, and D'Oiley offered him his own, but the general, saying, "It is well enough, Charles," declined it. Skippon, who was now far advanced in life, received a wound in the side at the beginning of the engagement, and being desired by Fairfax to go off the field, he answered he would not stir so long as a man would stand. About 600 of the King's forces were killed and about 5000 taken prisoners. There were also taken 8000 stand of arms, with all the artillery, and a very rich booty, "many coaches, with store of wealth in

general use, nor am I able to say what number of men the term as here used indicated. Mr. Motley, in his "History of the Rise of the Dutch Republic," ii. 88, 89, edition, London, 1861, says, "An army of chosen troops was forthwith collected by taking the four legions, or terzios, of Naples, Sicily, Sardinia, and Lombardy, and filling their places in Italy by fresh levies. About 10,000 veteran soldiers were thus obtained, of whom the Duke of Alva was appointed general-in-chief." A terzio would thus amount to about 2500 men. But it appears to have sometimes exceeded that number, for Mr. Motley, in his "History of the United Netherlands," ii. 456, London, John Murray, Albemarle Street, 1860, says, "The famous terzio of Naples, under Carlos Pinelo, arrived 3500 strong—the most splendid regiment ever known in the history of war. Every man had an engraved corslet and musket-barrel, and there were many who wore gilded armour." But when that Spanish infantry came into collision with the soldiers of Cromwell, the splendour of their arms availed them little. Many an Englishman will sympathise with the emotion of national pride felt, as described by Macaulay, by the banished Cavaliers, when in Flanders "they saw a brigade of their countrymen, outnumbered by foes and abandoned by friends, drive before them in headlong rout the finest infantry of Spain, and force a passage into a counterscarp which had just been pronounced impregnable by the ablest of the marshals of France."—Macaulay's History of Engand, i. 59. London: Longmans, 1864.

them," including, besides the baggage of the Court and officers, the rich plunder of Leicester. Above all, the King's coach, with his private cabinet of letters and papers, fell into the hands of the victors, whose loss in killed was very small—May says scarcely 100.[1]

Although the newly-raised London Apprentices do not appear to have evinced at Naseby quite the same degree of steadiness which they had so signally displayed at the first battle of Newbury, there are some remarks of Andrew Fletcher of Saltoun respecting them which are well deserving of attention. "The battle of Naseby," he says, "is generally thought to have been the deciding action of the late civil war. The number of forces was equal on both sides, nor was there any advantage in the ground, or extraordinary accident that happened during the fight, which could be of considerable importance to either. In the army of the Parliament, nine only of the officers had served abroad, and most of the soldiers were prentices drawn out of London but two months before. In the King's army there were above 1000 officers that had served in foreign parts: yet was that army routed and broken by those new-raised prentices; who were observed to be obedient to command, and brave in fight; not only in that action, but on all occasions during that active campaign. The people of these nations are not a dastardly crew, like those born in misery under oppression and slavery, who must have time to rub off that fear, cowardice, and stupidity which they bring from home. And the officers seem to stand in more need of experience than private soldiers; yet in that battle it was seen that the sobriety and principle of the officers on the one side

[1] Sprigge's Anglia Rediviva, pp. 33-45. Rush., vi. 41 *et seq.* Whitelock, p. 150 *et seq.* Cromwelliana, pp. 18, 19. May, Breviary Hist. Parl.

prevailed over the experience of those on the other."[1] Fletcher also brings forward in support of his views the actions of Montrose, which he compares with those of Cæsar, "as well for the military skill as the bad tendency of them, though," he adds, "the Marquess had never served abroad, nor seen any action before the six victories which, with numbers much inferior to those of his enemies, he obtained in one year; and the most considerable of them were chiefly gained by the assistance of the tenants and vassals of the family of Gordon."[2]

The letters found in the King's cabinet completely proved the falsehood of the assertions of the King, made with the most solemn appeals to Heaven, in regard to his negotiations with foreign powers for supplies of troops. They also fully established the insincerity with which he had entered into treaty with the Parliament, and exposed some of his intentions with regard to Ireland. These letters were publicly read in London at a common hall, before a great assembly of citizens and many members of both Houses of Parliament, where leave was given to as many as pleased or knew the King's handwriting to peruse and examine them all, in order to refute the report of those who said that the letters were counterfeit or forgeries. And shortly after a selection from them was printed and published by command of Parliament. In a letter to Sir Edward Nicholas, dated the 4th of August of this year, Charles himself admits that the letters are genuine.[3]

[1] Discourse of Government with Relation to Militias, pp. 43, 44. Edinburgh, 1698.

[2] Ibid., pp. 42, 43.

[3] Appendix to Evelyn's Memoirs, pp. 101, 102. Clar. iv. 658, Charles says, "I will neither deny that those things are mine which they have set out in my name (only some words here and there mistaken, and some com'as misplaced, but not much material), nor as a good Protestant, nor honest man, blush for any of those papers."

May has thus summed up the effect of the publication of these letters; "From the reading of these letters many discourses of the people arose. For in them appeared his transactions with the Irish rebels, and with the Queen for assistance from France and the Duke of Lorrain. Many good men were sorry that the King's actions agreed no better with his words; that he openly protested before God, with horrid imprecations, that he endeavoured nothing so much as the preservation of the Protestant religion, and rooting out of Popery; yet, in the meantime, underhand, he promised to the Irish rebels an abrogation of the laws against them, which was contrary to his late expressed promises in these words, I will never abrogate the laws against the Papists. And again he said, I abhor to think of bringing foreign soldiers into the kingdom; and yet he solicited the Duke of Lorrain, the French, the Danes, and the very Irish for assistance. They were vexed also that the King was so much ruled by the will of his wife as to do everything by her prescript, and that peace, war, religion, and Parliament should be at her disposal. It appeared, besides, out of these letters, with what mind the King treated with the Parliament at Uxbridge, and what could be hoped for by that treaty when, writing to the Queen, he affirms that, if he could have had but two more consenting to his vote, he would not have given the name of Parliament to them at Westminster: at last he agreed to it in this sense, that it was not all one to call them a Parliament and to acknowledge them so to be, and upon that reason (which might have displeased his own side) he calls those with him at Oxford a mongrel Parliament."[1] All these things were well calculated to open the eyes of many of Charles's followers, as

[1] May, Breviary of the History of the Parliament.

well as to confirm his adversaries in their distrust of him.

Montrose having, as has been stated, effected his retreat from Dundee, proceeded northward. The Lord Gordon, Huntly's eldest son, who continued attached to Montrose, was despatched by him to bring back the gentlemen of his family, and his influence soon assembled a considerable force. General Baillie learning this, detached Urry with a force which he thought sufficient to destroy Lord Gordon, while he himself endeavoured to engage the attention of Montrose. But Montrose eluding Baillie's attempts to bring him to action, traversed with great rapidity the mountains of the north, and came into the heart of Mar, where Lord Gordon joined him with 1000 foot and 200 horse. He then marched directly to the Spey to find out Urry, and if possible to force him to an engagement before he received some reinforcements he was expecting. Montrose had marched with such rapidity as to anticipate all accounts of his movements, so that he was within six miles of Urry when the latter did not imagine he had yet crossed the Grampian Hills. When Urry found him so near, that he might not be obliged to fight before he got his reinforcements, he crossed the Spey in all haste, and marched towards Inverness, which he had appointed as the place of rendezvous for all his forces, pursued so close by Montrose that he had much ado to reach Inverness, where he was joined by the Covenanters of the shire of Moray, by the Earls of Seaforth and Sutherland, by the clan of the Frasers, and some veterans that were in the garrison of Inverness; so that, according to Wishart, his army now amounted to 3500 foot and 400 horse, while, according to the same authority, that of Mon-

trose consisted of no more than 1500 foot and 250 horse.[1] But Wishart's statement of Montrose's force is here manifestly inaccurate, and made up so as to convey to careless readers an exaggerated notion of Urry's superiority of numbers. Yet Wishart, though he understates Montrose's force, also understates Urry's. According to a better authority than Wishart, Spalding, at Aulderne Urry's force was estimated at about 4000 foot and 500 horse, and Montrose's at about 3000 foot and horse.[2] Next day Montrose encamped at the village of Aulderne, in the neighbourhood of Nairné, and as he was reduced to the dilemma either immediately to give Urry battle on very unequal terms, or run the greater risk of being hemmed in between two armies, Baillie with a still stronger army than Urry's being now advanced a considerable way on that side the Grampians on his march towards him, he resolved to choose the most advantageous ground, and there await the enemy.

The village stood upon a height, with a valley behind it on the opposite side to that by which the enemy approached. In this valley he drew up his forces entirely out of the view of the enemy. In front of the village he posted a few chosen foot together with his cannon, where they were covered by some dikes, which in Scotland are low walls made either of turf or rough stones put together without mortar, the latter being termed "dry-stane

[1] Wishart's statement of Montrose's force would certainly seem to be here under the mark, according even to his own account, for he says that Montrose had just been joined by Lord Gordon with 1000 foot and 200 horse (Wishart, p. 131), which would make his whole force before this junction only 550 in all, whereas he had at Dundee, according to Wishart himself (p. 121), 600 foot and 150 horse—while he "sent his weaker troops, and those who were but lightly armed, together with his heavy baggage, in by the foot of the hills, and ordered them to meet him at Brechin."—Wishart, p. 121.

[2] Spalding, ii. 319.

dikes." On his right wing he stationed Alexander Macdonald, called Colkitto, with 400 foot, in a place which was accidentally fortified with dikes and ditches, bushes and stones, and ordered them on no account to leave their station, which afforded the advantages of a fortified position. And as his object was to induce the enemy to send their best forces against that point, where by the disadvantage of the ground they could be of no service, he gave this right wing charge of the Royal standard, which was usually carried before himself. All the rest of his men he drew up in the opposite wing, putting the horse under the command of Lord Gordon and taking charge of the foot himself. By this disposition of his forces Montrose had in fact no centre; but that small body which he had stationed in front of the village, under covert of the dikes, made a show of one.

Urry, as Montrose had foreseen, deceived by these dispositions, attacked the right wing where the Royal standard was with the best part of his troops. Macdonald repulsed them with the fire of the Irish musketeers and the bows and arrows of the Highlanders, who at that time still used those weapons; but when the enemy taunted him with cowardice for sheltering himself behind the dikes and bushes, Macdonald, whose bravery exceeded his discretion, and who was indeed daring even to rashness, sallied forth from his defensible position and faced the enemy, who by their superiority in numbers, and by their cavalry, soon threw his men into disorder, and had he not by great personal exertions succeeded in drawing them off to an enclosure hard by, they had all been lost together with the Royal standard. He himself was the last man that entered the enclosure, thus covering alone the retreat of his men. Some pikemen pressed him so hard as to fix

their pikes in his target; and it has been recorded as a proof of the power of the Highland claymore wielded by a strong arm, that he repeatedly freed himself of his assailants by cutting off the heads of the pikes from the shafts with his broadsword by threes and fours at a stroke.[1] Just as Montrose was on the point of making a general assault upon the enemy with all the troops which he had upon the left wing, a trusty messenger came and whispered in his ear that Macdonald and his party on the right wing were put to flight. Montrose, with that presence of mind which never deserted him, immediately called out to Lord Gordon, "What are we doing? Macdonald has routed the enemy on the right. Shall we look on and let him carry off all the honour of the day?" With these words he instantly led on the charge. Urry's horse soon fled, leaving the flanks of their army quite open and exposed. The foot, though even when deserted by the horse they stood firm for some time, for they were veteran troops, were at length also compelled to fly with great loss. Montrose now came to the assistance of Macdonald. Here also Urry's horse immediately fled, but his foot, who were mostly old soldiers, fought desperately, and fell almost every man in his rank where he stood.[2] Wishart says that of Urry's army there were slain about 3000. According to another authority, there were reckoned to be slain of Urry's troops above 2000.[3] However, as Spalding, who gives this estimate, states that "the Chancellor's regiment, called Loudon's regiment, the Lothian regiment, Lawers' and Buchanan's, were for the most part cut off,"[4] we may infer that the number of the killed on Urry's side was nearer 3000 than 2000. Spald-

[1] Wishart, p. 136.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Spalding, ii. 319.
[4] Ibid.

ing adds that Montrose had "some twenty-four gentlemen hurt, and some few Irishis killed." The regiment called Lawers' regiment was a very distinguished and gallant one, composed of Highlanders of the Argyle party or clan, and their colonel, the Laird of Lawers, a Campbell, was, according to Spalding, killed in the battle, and his brother taken prisoner.[1] We shall meet with Lawers' regiment of Highlanders again at the battle of Dunbar, where they fought with the same devoted gallantry as here, and with the same ill success, being cut off almost to a man by Cromwell's troopers and pikemen. But it was the misfortune of the brave and hardy Highlanders of that time that, except under Montrose, they never almost met with a leader worthy of their unflinching endurance and their devoted valour. This battle of Aulderne was fought on the 4th of May 1645.

Urry was now compelled to join his scattered forces with those of Baillie. After some marching and counter-marching the two armies again found themselves in the neighbourhood of each other near the village of Alford, on the river Don in Aberdeenshire. The Royalist writers say that the number of infantry was about 2000 in each army, but that Baillie had more than double Montrose's number of cavalry. On the other side, the Parliamentary writers affirm that Montrose had more than double the number of foot, and an equal number of horse. At all events, it is admitted by Wishart himself that 1000 of

[1] Spalding. As Campbell of Lawers became Earl of Loudon, there would appear to be some mistake or confusion here in Spalding. The regiment might have been led by a relation of Loudon the Chancellor, who in this way might receive the pay of several regiments, as besides Lawers' regiment and Loudon's regiment, there was Lawers' horse (Balfour, iii. 176), sometimes called the Laird of Lawers' musquetaires (Balfour, iv. 9); where the word "musquetaires" is used in the sense of the French "mousquetaires," who corresponded to the English or Scottish regiments of Life or Horse Guards.

Baillie's veteran soldiers had been taken from him to be put under the command of Argyle or Lindsay, while as many raw undisciplined troops were given him in return. In fact Baillie was all along thwarted and hampered in all his movements by the Committee of Estates, particularly through the influence of Argyle, who fancied himself born a general, as he was born the chief of a warlike clan. It is said that Baillie, who was an experienced and wary general, was forced to this engagement much against his inclination by the rashness of Lord Balcarres, who commanded a regiment of horse, and had precipitated himself and his regiment into danger, so that they could not be brought off without risking the whole army. The battle was fought 2d July 1645, and Montrose obtained a complete victory with the loss of not one private soldier and only two officers. But his friend Lord Gordon, whose death was a great loss to him, was killed near the close of the action.[1]

The Scottish Parliament, "supported by the counsels of Argyle, who," says Sir Walter Scott, "was bold in council though timid in battle,"[2] soon raised new forces, and Baillie was appointed to the command. But a Committee of the Estates, consisting of Argyle, Lanark, and Crawford-Lindsay, was nominated to attend his army and control his motions. The Government of Scotland, like the other European governments of the Middle Ages, had consisted originally of a feudal aristocracy with a king at the head of it. But it is remarkable what a dearth of military talent had appeared for a long series of ages in those kings and that aristocracy. From the time of Robert Bruce and his companion in arms James Douglas,

[1] Wishart, chap. xi.

[2] History of Scotland in Tales of a Grandfather, i. 444. Robert Cadell, Edinburgh, 1846.

from the beginning of the fourteenth to the middle of the seventeenth century—that is, for a period of more than three hundred years—not one man except Montrose had they produced of average talents for war. For the preceding century, moreover, the aristocracy had been degenerating into an oligarchy, so that now the chance of military talent arising among them was far less than ever. Notwithstanding all this, these oligarchies, on whose tyrannical pride and hereditary folly all the lessons of experience were utterly lost, insisted on doing what, with the exception of the Roman Senate, oligarchies have done from the beginning, and will do to the end of time—on substituting the counsels of presumptuous ignorance and rashness for those of military skill and prudence, and on treating men who had raised themselves to command by skill and valour with the supercilious insolence which is as apparent in their caste now as it was two hundred years ago. General Baillie in his "Vindication" gives a most instructive picture of the conduct of a war by an oligarchy. He says that when Argyle asked what was next to be done, he answered, "The direction should come from his Lordship and those of the Committee;" and he adds, "I told the Marquess of Argyle I found myself slighted in everything belonging to a commander-in-chief. . . . While I was present others did sometimes undertake the command of the army."[1] The consequence was what was to be expected.

Montrose had descended from the mountains and advanced southward at the head of a larger army than he had ever commanded since the time when he first marched against Aberdeen at the head of the Covenanters; and

[1] Lieutenant-General Baillie's "Vindication for his own part of Kilsyth and Preston," in Principal Baillie's Letters and Journals, ii. 420. Edinburgh, 1841.

after threatening Perth, where the Scottish Parliament then sat in consequence of the plague being in Edinburgh, approached the shores of the Forth. After many acts of ravage, the principal of which was the destruction of Castle Campbell,[1] belonging to the house of Argyle, situated on an eminence in a narrow glen of the Ochil chain of hills, which the vengeance of the Ogilvies for the destruction by Argyle of their castle of Airlie, "the bonnie house of Airlie," naturally enough doomed to flames and ruin, Montrose marched westward along the northern bank of the Forth, and passing by the town and castle of Stirling, in which the enemy had then a very strong garrison, crossed the river that night at a ford four miles above the town. Next morning about day-break he halted a little about six miles from Stirling, when he was informed that Baillie's army had not crossed the Firth that night, but had lain about three miles from Stirling on the other side of the river. Montrose then continuing his march, encamped in the fields about Kilsyth, and ordered his men to refresh themselves, but to be ready either for an engagement or a march upon the first notice. In the meantime Baillie's army had also crossed the Forth by the bridge of Stirling, and encamped in the evening within three miles of Kilsyth. Baillie, who knew by experience the talents of Montrose, and considered that an army composed as his was might be tired out by cautious operations, in the course of which the Highlanders would be likely to return home, would have avoided a battle. But the committee of oligarchs who controlled and

[1] This castle had formerly, perhaps from the character of its situation, been called the castle of Gloom, and it stood on the banks of the brook of Grief or Gryfe, and in the parish of Doulour or Dollar. In the sixteenth century the Earl of Argyle obtained an Act of Parliament for changing its name to Castle Campbell.

thwarted the veteran general insisted on risking the last army which the Covenanters had in Scotland, and accordingly they advanced against Montrose at break of day on the 15th of August 1645.

When Montrose saw what they were about, he was as much delighted as Cromwell afterwards was when a council of incapables, in part composed of the same magnates, drew down the Scottish army from their fastness of Down Hill near Dunbar. He said that it fell out just as he could have wished, and that he would supply his deficiency of men by the advantage of the ground. For, according to Wishart, Montrose's army consisted of 4400 foot and 500 horse, that of the enemy of 6000 foot and 1000 horse.[1] But some of the Parliamentary writers say that Montrose's army was upwards of 6000. Montrose ordered his men to fight stripped to their shirts. The first attack of the enemy was upon an advanced post of Montrose, which occupied a strong position among cottages and enclosures. The repulse of this attack with some loss to the Covenanters so much animated a body of 1000 Highlanders who were posted hard by, that without waiting for orders they ran directly up the hill to pursue the fugitives and attack the troops who were advancing to support them. Two regiments of horse became disordered by the sudden and furious assault of the Highlanders. Montrose, seizing the decisive moment, ordered first a troop of horse under the command of the Earl of Airlie, and then his whole army, to charge the enemy, who had not yet got into line, their rear and centre coming up too slowly to the support of their van. The shout and speed with which the Highlanders charged struck a panic into the enemy, whose horse soon fled, and their foot throwing away their arms en-

[1] Wishart, p. 168.

deavoured also to save themselves by flight. But in vain, for the pursuit continued with great slaughter for fourteen miles. Scarce 100 of the foot escaped with their lives. Many of the horse were also killed. All their arms and baggage fell into the hands of the conquerors. Montrose lost only six men. As usual, since the military aristocracy had been changed into an oligarchy (for they behaved very differently at Flodden), the noblemen in the Covenanters' army saved themselves by a timely flight and the swiftness of their horses. Some of them reached the castle of Stirling, while others fled to the Firth of Forth and went on board some ships they found lying at anchor there. Among these was Argyle, who now for the third time saved himself by means of a boat.[1]

Edinburgh now surrendered to Montrose, and Glasgow, to which Montrose proceeded as the plague was raging in Edinburgh, paid a heavy contribution. The noblemen and other persons of distinction who had been imprisoned as Royalists in Edinburgh and elsewhere were set at liberty; and so many prisoners of rank now declared for Montrose, that he felt himself in force sufficient to call a parliament at Glasgow in the King's name. Still Montrose was not in a condition, from the want of heavy artillery as well as of a regularly-disciplined army, to reduce the castles of Edinburgh, Stirling, Dumbarton, and other places of strength. He wrote to the King, urging him to advance to the northern border and form a junction with his victorious army; and he concluded his request with the words which the lieutenant of King David, Joab, a man who in his cruelty and in his ignominious end, for "the innocent blood which he had shed,"[2] was a prototype of himself, is recorded to have used to the King of Israel: "I have

[1] Wishart, chap. xiii.

[2] 1 Kings ii. 31.

fought against Rabbah, and have taken the city of waters. Now therefore gather the rest of the people together, and encamp against the city, and take it; lest I take the city, and it be called after my name." [1]

But although under the old system of the Parliamentary army of England, even after his defeat at Naseby, Charles might have been allowed leisure and opportunity enough to raise new forces, and march with them to the borders of Scotland and effect a junction with Montrose, in the new-modelled Parliamentary army matters were managed very differently. Fairfax and Cromwell were not men to lose a day or an hour, and the victory of Naseby was followed up without intermission by a succession of fresh victories, each of much smaller moment indeed than Naseby, but all converging to one point and one purpose. So that while Montrose had been gaining the victories of Aulderne, of Alford, and Kilsyth for the King in Scotland, England presented a very different spectacle, where Fairfax and Cromwell were taking from the Royalists town after town and fortress after fortress, and totally defeating every body of men in the shape of a Royal army that made head against them.

Charles had detached Lord Digby, accompanied by Sir Marmaduke Langdale, with 1200 horse, to join Montrose. This detachment was augmented by 300 gentlemen, and at Doncaster defeated a regiment of horse and took prisoners about 1000 foot. But Colonel Copley came up with them at Sherborn in Yorkshire with about 1300 horse, and completely defeated them. He not only recovered the prisoners, but took 300 of Digby's force, with his own coach, in which were found several letters and papers of great importance in laying open the Royal

[1] 2 Samuel xii. 27, 28.

designs, in particular some letters respecting an application by Sir Kenelm Digby to the Pope for assistance.[1] As Montrose marched south with a view of forming a juncture with Digby, the Gordons deserted him, and many of the Highlanders returned home. David Leslie had been detached from the army of the Scots in England with a large body of horse and some foot to prevent a junction between Digby's force and that of Montrose. On the defeat of Digby, Leslie proceeded northward by rapid marches with the view of intercepting at the Forth the retreat of Montrose to the mountains. But when he reached Gladsmuir, about three miles and a half to the west of Haddington, learning that Montrose was quartered near Selkirk, he suddenly altered his march, and on the morning of the 13th September 1645, under the cover of a thick mist, approached Philiphaugh, an elevated ascent on the left bank of the Ettrick, where Montrose's infantry lay encamped, while his cavalry, with Montrose himself, were quartered in the town of Selkirk. A considerable stream was thus interposed between the two parts of Montrose's army. Leslie's troops, many of whom were, it has been said, old soldiers of Gustavus Adolphus, and some no doubt may have had relatives slaughtered and outraged by Montrose's barbarians, made a furious attack on the enemy. Notwithstanding the great personal exertions of Montrose, who hastily assembled his cavalry, crossed the Ettrick, and omitted nothing which cool courage could do (his usual skill and foresight seem to have deserted him both in separating the two parts of his army and in not securing better information of Leslie's movements), his army was totally defeated. The prisoners taken were shot in the courtyard of Newark Castle upon Yarrow.

[1] Rush., vi. 128 *et seq.* Clar., iv. 715 *et seq.*

Others of higher rank also died afterwards by the hands of the executioner. And who that remembers the Aberdeen massacre, to say nothing of a hundred other outrages and crimes, will say that they did not deserve their fate?

There are few cases in which what has been called "the lying spirit of romance" has been more active in perverting historical truth than the case of James Graham, Marquis of Montrose. I do not know whether similar attempts were ever made to throw a halo of false splendour round the blood-stained name of Alva; but there seems to have been nearly as much reason for it as there was in the case of Montrose. Alva and Montrose were both lieutenants appointed for the purpose of subjugating countries to tyrants who aimed at absolute dominion over the souls as well as the bodies of mankind. Ferdinando Alvarez de Toledo, Duke of Alva, had proved, as well as James Graham, Earl and afterwards Marquis of Montrose, in his youth and early manhood, that he could display, when necessary, that headlong courage which has received the name of heroism. There was indeed more in the early career of Alva than in that of Montrose to create a hero of romance. There is no such romantic incident in the life of Montrose as Alva's ride from Hungary to Spain and back again in seventeen days for the sake of a brief visit to his newly-married wife; nor any such brilliant exploit as Alva's passage of the Elbe and the battle of Mühlberg. As he grew older, to these qualities of his early days Alva added that of being the most consummate master of his time of the art of war. Now, notwithstanding these brilliant qualities, what sort of a name has Alva left behind him? He has left the name of perhaps the most inhuman and bloodthirsty tyrant that has ever appeared upon earth. I will quote

his character as a man in the apt words of Mr. Motley: "As a man, his character was simple. He did not combine a great variety of vices, but those which he had were colossal, and he possessed no virtues. He was neither lustful nor intemperate, but his professed eulogists admitted his enormous avarice, while the world has agreed that such an amount of stealth and ferocity, of patient vindictiveness and universal bloodthirstiness, *were never found in a savage beast of the forest, and but rarely in a human bosom.*"[1]

The words in this extract which are printed in italics are very significant; for while they describe such human beasts of prey as Philip II.'s lieutenant Alva, and Charles I.'s lieutenant Montrose, they point to a very curious phenomenon in human nature, of which I have attempted an explanation in a former work when I had occasion to speak of Montrose. I find, on looking at that explanation (which I was not aware of when I wrote it), that the qualities which I have given as explaining Montrose's conduct also explain Alva's—namely, unbounded pride and strong fanaticism, accompanied by great power of dissimulation. The fanaticism of Montrose, however, was somewhat different from that of Alva, who was a fanatic in religion, while the idol which Montrose fanatically worshipped was only ambition, or perhaps what is called military glory. Notwithstanding the false glare which Scott's genius has thrown around the names of Montrose and Dundee, they were in fact but Scotch Alvas, as bloodthirsty themselves as Alva, and the instruments of tyrants as bloodthirsty as Philip II. What Macaulay says of Dundee may be said of Montrose also. "Brave as he undoubtedly was, he seems, like many other brave men, to

[1] Motley's Rise of the Dutch Republic, ii. 92. London, 1861.

have been less proof against the danger of assassination than against any other form of danger. He knew what the hatred of the Covenanters was: he knew how well he had earned their hatred; he was haunted by that consciousness of inexpiable guilt, and by that dread of a terrible retribution which the ancient polytheists personified under the awful name of the Furies. His old troopers, the Satans and Beelzebubs who had shared his crimes, and who now shared his perils, were ready to be the companions of his flight."[1]

It would be as tedious as it is needless to give an account of all the military operations in this war, but one or two may be given as illustrations of the general nature of the war, and of the character of the times.

On his march to the relief of Taunton, Fairfax was met by large parties of clubmen, country-men, yeomen, and peasantry, who had assembled in considerable numbers to protect their homes and property; and were afterwards joined by some gentlemen. The efforts of the clubmen had at first been principally directed to the checking of the cruelties and licentiousness of the Royalist troops. But they afterwards declared themselves hostile to the Parliamentary troops also. Fairfax succeeded for the time in conciliating them by yielding to some of their demands. Subsequently, as the clubmen rose in great numbers in Dorset, Wilts, and Somerset, Cromwell was despatched against them. He succeeded in persuading most of them to return peaceably to their homes. But as a part of them fired upon a detachment of horse he had sent under a lieutenant to inquire into the cause of their hostile proceedings, and killed some of his men, he found it necessary to attack them, and about 200 were wounded.

[1] Macaulay's History of England, iii. 17. London, 1864.

These being taken prisoners, were after an examination regarding their instigators, dismissed on their promise not to engage in similar proceedings. The original motive of the clubmen was sufficiently explained in the motto of one of their standards—

> "If you offer to plunder our cattle,
> Be assured we will give you battle."[1]

After the fall of Bristol—which Rupert, after a defence forming a strong contrast to Blake's defence of Lyme and Taunton, surrendered to the army of the Parliament, September 10, 1645—the King signified his pleasure to the Lords of the Council that they should require Prince Rupert to deliver his commission into their hands. He likewise wrote a letter to Rupert, dated "Hereford, 14th September 1645," in which he says: "I must remember you of your letter of the 12th of August, whereby you assured me that, if no mutiny happened, you would keep Bristol for four months. Did you keep it four days? Was there anything like a mutiny? More questions might be asked; but now, I confess, to little purpose: my conclusion is, to desire you to seek your subsistence, until it shall please God to determine of my condition, somewhere beyond the seas—to which end I send you herewith a pass."[2]

Cromwell, in his letter to the Speaker of 14th October 1645, gives an account of the storming of Basing House, which had been strongly fortified by the Marquis of Winchester, and had hitherto withstood every siege, either

[1] Rush., vi. 89 *et seq.* Sprigge's Anglia Rediviva, p. 55 *et seq.*

[2] This letter is given in Clarendon's History of the Rebellion, v. 252, 253. Oxford, 1826. In Clarendon's MS., at the place where the letter is to come in, are the words, "Enter the letter." The editor says, "See the Clarendon State Papers;" but this letter is not to be found among them, at least I have not been able to find it.

beating off or wearying out the assailants. The Marquis had declared that if the King had no more ground in England but Basing House, he would hold it out to the last extremity, and that Basing House was called Loyalty. Hugh Peters, in his relation to the House of Commons, says, "The old house had stood (as it is reported) two or three hundred years, a nest of idolatry, the new house surpassing that in beauty and stateliness, and either of them fit to make an emperor's court." It contained "provisions for some years rather than months; 400 quarters of wheat, bacon divers rooms full (containing hundreds of flitches), cheese proportionable, with oatmeal, beef, pork, beer divers cellars full, and that very good."[1] Cromwell writes: "After our batteries placed we settled the several posts for the storm. . . . We stormed this morning [October 14, 1645] after six of the clock; and our men fell on with great resolution and cheerfulness; we took the two houses without any considerable loss to ourselves; Colonel Pickering stormed the new house, passed through and got the gate of the old house; whereupon they summoned a parley, which our men would not hear. . . . We have had little loss; many of the enemy were put to the sword, and some officers of quality. Most of the rest we have prisoners, among which the Marquis. We have taken about ten pieces of ordnance, much ammunition, and our soldiers a good encouragement. I humbly offer to have the place slighted for these reasons: It will ask 800 men to man it, it is no frontier, the country is poor about it, the place exceedingly ruined by our batteries and mortar-pieces, and a fire which fell upon the place since our taking it."[2]

[1] Mr. Peters's Relation to the House of Commons, in Sprigge, p. 139.
[2] Cromwell to the Speaker, October 14, 1645.

Hugh Peters came into Basing House some little time after it had been taken by storm, and in a letter to the House of Commons mentioned that this was now the twentieth garrison that had been taken in this summer by the army. He says—"In the several rooms and about the house there were slain seventy-four, and only one woman, the daughter of Doctor Griffith, who by her railing provoked our soldiers (then in heat) into a further passion. There lay dead upon the ground Major Cuffle (a man of great account amongst them, and a notorious Papist), slain by the hands of Major Harrison; and Robinson the player, who a little before the storm was known to be mocking and scorning the Parliament and our army."[1] Scott in "Woodstock" represents this Robinson as having been "murdered by that butcher's dog," as he makes Wildrake style Harrison, "after surrender at the battle of Naseby." I suppose Hugh Peters's authority is better than Scott's as to the place of Robinson's death; and as to Harrison's having murdered him after surrender, it is as true as their calling him the "brand of a butcher's mastiff" because he was the son of a grazier, and "bloody" when he was a most humane as well as honourable man. Even King Charles having closely observed Harrison, who commanded the guard that accompanied the King from Hurst-Castle to Windsor, said to Herbert he looked like a soldier, and not like an assassin, for by letter he had been informed that Harrison intended to assassinate him.

About the time when Fairfax had driven Hopton into a remote part of Cornwall, a vessel from Waterford arrived at Padstow. It was suddenly boarded, and some letters were thrown by the captain into the sea, but being re-

[1] Mr. Peters's Relation to the House of Commons, in Sprigge's Anglia Rediviva, pp. 139-142.

covered, they laid open certain dealings of the King through the Earl of Glamorgan with the Roman Catholics in Ireland. Fairfax assembled the inhabitants of the neighbourhood and showed them the letters, which converted them very speedily from their enthusiastic devotion to the Royal cause.

Ormonde had endeavoured, by following out his instructions, to procure the co-operation of the Irish on terms which Charles had solemnly denied that he would ever grant. As negotiations were carried on with the Queen, and Sir Kenelm Digby solicited assistance directly from the Pope, His Holiness despatched his nuncio to encourage the Irish to insist on the restoration of their religion as the price of recovering the King's absolute power. Ormonde declined to proceed farther, and Lord Herbert, now created Earl of Glamorgan, son of the Marquis of Worcester, being a rigid Catholic, was selected as a fit instrument for conducting the business; for the Queen, dissatisfied with Ormonde, had declared that no Protestant was to be trusted in such an affair. Glamorgan had some property in Ireland, which afforded him an excuse to visit that country. "My instructions and powers," says Glamorgan in a letter to the Earl of Clarendon dated the 11th of June 1660, "were signed by the King under his pocket-signet, with blanks for me to put in the names of the Pope or princes, to the end that the King might have a starting-hole to deny the having given me such commissions, if excepted against by his own subjects, leaving me as it were at the stake, who for His Majesty's sake was willing to undergo it, trusting to his word alone. In like manner did I not stick upon having this commission enrolled or assented unto by his Council, nor indeed the seal to be put on it in an ordinary manner, but as Mr. Endymion Porter and I

could perform it with rollers and no screw-press." It was also resolved that the King should have seemed angry with him at his return out of Ireland, until, says he, "I had brought him into a posture and power to own his commands, to make good his instructions, and to reward my faithfulness and zeal therein." The royal design, as laid open in the same letter, was to bring one army of 10,000 from Ireland through North Wales, and another of 10,000 through South Wales; while a third of 6000 was to have been brought from the Continent, and supported by the Pope and Catholic princes at the rate of £30,000 a month. Furnished with these powers to treat with the Pope and Catholic princes as well as with the Irish Catholics, and also with powers to erect a mint and dispose of the revenue and delinquents' estates, Glamorgan set out for Ireland; but lest Ormonde should suspect the extent of his powers, the King resorted to the most unworthy artifices. Glamorgan concluded a treaty with the confederated council of the Irish Catholics for the supply of troops, upon the condition of removing all disqualifications, and allowing their clergy to retain all the livings which they had held from December 1641. Glamorgan's commission had been suspected, but Charles's steady denial of it had silenced the rumours respecting it, till the seizure of the papers at Padstow laid open the whole business. While the affair was in this state, Digby arrived in Ireland, and in conjunction with Ormonde committed Glamorgan to prison on a charge of high treason, for having counterfeited a commission from the King and grossly abused his name. Glamorgan, confident of his innocence of that charge, and of his continued influence over the King, bore the imprisonment with calmness; and Charles, after most solemnly disclaiming having ever granted him

powers which were not to be exercised under the guidance of Ormonde, wrote for his liberation. Glamorgan then, in pursuance of his original powers, backed by fresh letters from Charles, recommenced his intrigues, which however were rendered fruitless by the ruin of the Royal cause both in England and Scotland.[1]

Ever since the battle of Naseby the army of the Parliament had met with uninterrupted success. The exertions of the men and their leaders had been great and unremitted even in the season during which it had been the custom to retire into winter quarters. But Fairfax and Cromwell, who had no wish to "spin out the war like soldiers of fortune beyond sea," who, on the contrary, were wholly bent on the finishing of this destructive war, disregarded all obstacles and hardships that stood in the way of such a work. "The things," says May, "which that new army did that year, taking no rest all that sharp and bitter winter, were much to be wondered at; how many strong towns and forts they took, how many field victories they obtained, the stories of every several mouth will declare."[2] Fairfax was now advancing rapidly with the army of the west upon Oxford, which was already in a state of blockade. The Prince of Wales, attended by

[1] Birch's Inquiry. Clar. State Papers, ii. 187, 201–203, 337, 346, &c., Carte's Let., i. 80–82. Rush., vi. chap. iii. I may here add to my remark in a note a page or two back, on the King's letter to Rupert not being to be found among the Clarendon State Papers, though the editor of Clarendon's History refers to those papers for it, a remark from a note of Mr. Brodie on Glamorgan's commission to conclude a treaty of co-operation with the Irish Catholics: "As to the transporting of Glamorgan's commission, and the eagerness with which it was expected, see Carte's Let., i. 80–82; Birch, p. 58; Clar. State Papers, ii. 187. Had the editor of the Clarendon Papers attended to the letters published by Carte, he would have found that no other commission could be alluded to here."—Brodie's History of the British Empire, iv. 40, note. Edinburgh, 1822.

[2] May's Breviary of the History of the Parliament.

Hyde, Culpepper, and other members of the Council, had fled to Scilly and thence to Jersey. Hopton had been obliged to capitulate and disband his forces; and Lord Astley, who had collected some 2000 horse with a view of relieving Oxford, was on the 22d of March 1646 intercepted at Stowe by the Parliamentary forces, defeated, and made prisoner with many of his officers and more than half his men. "You have done your work," said Astley to some of the Parliamentary officers, "and may now go to play, unless you fall out among yourselves."

The King having failed to attain his ends by force of arms, now resorted to negotiation—a word which meant much the same with him that it meant with Borgia. But besides that he was a good way behind Borgia in dexterity in the use of this weapon, he had to deal with opponents whom Borgia himself might have found more than a match for him. His main game was to play the Presbyterians and Independents against one another. In a letter to Lord Digby of the 26th March 1646, Charles says, "I am endeavouring to get to London, so that the conditions may be such as a gentleman may own, and that the rebels may acknowledge me King, being not without hope that I shall be able so to draw either the Presbyterians or Independents to side with me for extirpating the one the other, that I shall be really King again."[1] The result showed that Charles was altogether out in his calculations on this matter, inasmuch as the Independents first, if they did not "extirpate" the Presbyterians—for here Charles would seem to have had in his mind the murdering process of Borgia, of Philip II., and of Charles IX.—expelled them from Parliament and from power, and then cut off the head of Charles himself

[1] Carte's Ormonde, iii. 452.

—an act of extraordinary audacity in a pack of "rascals" —particularly as they did it not after the Borgian or Medicean fashion, but in open day, in the "broad place at Whitehall"[1] before his own palace.

Charles now began to think there was no time to lose if he would escape a siege in Oxford, of which he did not see the prospect of a very agreeable termination. On the 27th of April 1646 he left Oxford with only two attendants, Ashburnham and Hudson, disguised as the servant of Ashburnham, who was a Groom of the Chamber, while Hudson was the King's Chaplain. After travelling towards London as far as Harrow-on-the-Hill, he turned his course northward, and arrived at the Scottish camp before Newark on the 5th of May.[2] The Scots received the King with great outward respect, but guarded his person with vigilance. They immediately broke up the siege of Newark and marched northward, carrying the King with them, till they arrived at Newcastle, where, having a strong garrison, they halted to await the progress of negotiations.

The King on surrendering himself to the Scottish army

[1] These are the words in which the space in front of Whitehall is described in the minutes of the Council of State.

[2] Parl. Hist., iii. 463. Ashburnham's Narrative. London, 1830. There are many perplexing and, it would seem, irreconcilable discrepancies in the accounts both of the King's flight from Oxford and of his subsequent flight from Hampton Court—there being discrepancies in regard to the first between the narrative of Ashburnham and the narrative of Clarendon, as well as between the statements of Ashburnham, the Groom of the Chamber, of Hudson, the King's Chaplain, and of Montreuil, the French special envoy; and in regard to the second, between the statements in Ashburnham's Narrative, and those in Sir John Berkeley's Memoirs, and in Lord Clarendon. The reader will find many curious particulars as well as important observations in the volumes published by the late Lord Ashburnham, entitled "A Narrative by John Ashburnham of his Attendance on King Charles I.; to which is prefixed a Vindication of his Character and Conduct from the Misrepresentations of Lord Clarendon; by his lineal Descendant and present Representative" [the late Earl of Ashburnham]. Two vols. 8vo. London, 1830.

had despatched a message to the Parliament, informing them of what he had done, and desiring that they would send him such articles of pacification as they should agree upon, and offering to surrender Oxford, Newark, and whatever other strong places he might still possess, and order the troops he had on foot to lay down their arms. The places were surrendered accordingly; and such forces as the Royalists still maintained in various parts of England, and the army of Montrose in the Highlands of Scotland, were disbanded. The garrison of Oxford consisted of about 7000; and though part of them were Irish, not an insult was offered to one of their number; for from the time of the New Model the Parliamentary commanders were remarkable for the most scrupulous fulfilment of articles. An order was at the same time sent by Charles for the surrender of Dublin; but secret instructions of a different kind were despatched to his confidential agents. He sent privately to Ormonde, desiring him not to obey his public orders; and during his residence at Newcastle he was concerting the means of raising an army of 20,000 men in Ireland; and Glamorgan was empowered by him to purchase the assistance of the Roman Catholics on any conditions, even on that of pawning his three kingdoms.[1]

The negotiation between the King and the English Parliament was soon broken off; but another was opened between the English Parliament and the Scottish army respecting the disposal of the King's person. The result of this negotiation was an agreement on the part of the Scottish Commissioners at Newcastle to surrender the person of Charles to the Commissioners for the English Parliament on receiving a sum of £200,000, part of

[1] Clar. State Papers, ii. 237. Carte's Ormonde, iii. 452. Birch's Inquiry.

£400,000 agreed to be paid to the Scots on account of arrears of pay.[1] In pursuance of the Articles of Agreement, a sum of £200,000 in hard cash was sent off towards Newcastle, and paid at Northallerton to the Scottish receiver, who signed a receipt for it. On the 30th of January 164$\frac{6}{7}$, some days after the payment of the money, the Commissioners of the English Parliament—the Earl of Pembroke, two other peers and six commoners, with a numerous train—received from the Scottish Commissioners at Newcastle the person of the King. The Scottish troops evacuated that town on the same day. In regard to this transaction, which has been a common topic of reproach against the Scots, whose fault has in general rather been the other way—serving and suffering for their royal family not wisely but too well, instead of selling or betraying them—it has been remarked that it was the work not of the Scottish nation,[2] but of the oligarchy which then ruled Scotland; and who would take care that a very small portion of the money received under the name of arrears of pay should find its way into any other pockets but their own.

The impeachment of the bishops had been allowed to drop, but on the 26th of October 1646 an ordinance was passed for abolishing Episcopacy, and sequestering the lands of the Church for the use of the State.[3] An ordinance was also passed on the 24th of February 164$\frac{5}{6}$, abolishing the Court of Wards and Liveries, and all tenures by knight-service, without any compensation or equivalent to the State.[4] This ordinance, however, was not acted

[1] Parl. Hist., iii. 533, 534.

[2] "The two parties of Hamilton and Argyle continued well enough united till after the distribution of the money received for the sale of the King. . . . The Scottish nation had generally disliked the giving up of His Majesty."—Carte's Ormonde, ii. 13.

[3] Parl. Hist., iii. 528.

[4] Ibid., iii. 440.

upon at the time; for the dues of wardship and all the other feudal dues, with the exception of purveyance which was given up, continued to be rigorously exacted till 1656, when the Parliament, known as Barebone's Parliament, passed an Act "for the further establishing and confirming" the former ordinance.[1]

[1] These ordinances, however, as far as abolishing the dues of military tenures without *compensation to the State* went, were not acted on as long as the Commonwealth lasted, nor indeed till the Restoration. This is proved by the enactments by which, as knight-service or military attendance was a condition attached to the holders of land, assessments were imposed by Parliament on all real and personal property to defray the expense of the military and naval force. One of these enactments for 1656 is preserved in Scobell's Collection, part ii. p. 400, from which it appears that the sum required was raised "by an equal rate, wherein every twenty pounds in money, stock, or other personal estate, shall bear the like charge as shall be laid on every twenty shillings yearly rent, or yearly value of land." When the Stuarts returned at the ominous time styled the Restoration, 151 members of the Convention Parliament voted against 149 that the excise should be substituted "in full recompense for all tenures *in capite*, and by knight-service, and of the Court of Wards and Liveries" (Comm. Journ., November 21, 1660), notwithstanding the strong opposition of some members who spoke vehemently against the excise as an unjust impost on those who had no lands to free those who had lands from the feudal conditions which constituted the purchase-money of their lands.—Parl. Hist., iv. 148, 149. Accordingly, the Act 12 Car. II. c. 24 was passed, intituled "An Act for taking away the Court of Wards and Liveries, and tenures *in capite*, and by knight-service, and purveyance, and for settling a revenue upon His Majesty in lieu thereof." It is observed by an eminent lawyer that the Act has been framed, notwithstanding the interest taken in it by Sir Heneage Finch, then solicitor-general, with strange inaccuracy. "The title of the Act," observes Mr. Hargrave, "expresses that it was made for taking away tenure *in capite;* and the first enacting clause proceeds on the same idea. But had the Act been accurately penned, it would simply have discharged such tenure of its oppressive fruits and incidents; which would have assimilated it to *free and common socage*, without the appearance of attempting to annihilate the *indelible* distinction between holding *immediately* of the King, and holding of him through the medium of other lords."—Hargrave Co. Litt., 108, a. n. (5). The benevolence of the Convention patriots who professed such zeal to relieve the landed property of England from its oppressive incidents did not extend to copyholds, which had their oppressive incidents also. But there were probably no copyholders then in the House. In a case which occurred soon after the Revolution it was decided that the statute 12 Car. II. c. 24 does not extend to copyholds; and the reason given is that "*it might be very prejudicial to lords of manors.*"—Clench *v.* Cudmore. Lutw. 371. 3 Lev. 395. Comb. 253.

## CHAPTER XVIII.

*MISREPRESENTATIONS OF THE ROYALISTS, PRESBYTERIANS, AND OTHERS RESPECTING CROMWELL AND IRETON.*

WE now come to a very difficult and perplexing part of our story—to get at the exact truth in which is like attempting to solve a problem of three bodies acting upon one another—the three bodies in this case being indicated in the letter of King Charles quoted towards the end of the seventeenth chapter, in which the King uses these words: "Being not without hope that I shall be able so to draw either the Presbyterians or Independents to side with me for extirpating the one or the other, that I shall be really King again."[1]

In entering on this part of the subject, it is first to be observed that the contemporary writers, who for want of better must serve as our witnesses in coming to a judicial conclusion, are all Royalist or Presbyterian but two, Ludlow and Mrs. Hutchinson—Whitelock's Memorials having been tampered with, cannot be relied on in any doubtful matter. Consequently the majority of the witnesses are, as might be expected, witnesses against Cromwell. It is, however, of importance to observe, that of the two witnesses on the side of the Independents, Mrs. Hutchinson and Ludlow, Mrs. Hutchinson is the witness to be relied on as regards the negotiations with the King carried on by Cromwell and Ireton, and she uses the following remark-

[1] Carte's Ormonde, iii. 452.

able words: "The King, by reason of his daily converse with the officers, had begun tampering with them, not only then but before, and had drawn in some of them to engage to corrupt others to fall in with him; but to speak the truth of all, Cromwell was at that time so incorruptibly faithful to his trust and to the people's interest, that he could not be drawn in to practise even his own usual and natural dissimulation on this occasion. His son-in-law Ireton, who was as faithful as he, was not so fully of the opinion (till he had tried it and found to the contrary) but that the King might have been managed to comply with the public good of his people, after he could no longer uphold his own violent will; but upon some discourses with him, the King uttering these words to him, 'I shall play my game as well as I can,' Ireton replied, 'If your Majesty have a *game* to play, you must give us also the liberty to play ours.' Colonel Hutchinson privately discoursing with his cousin, about the communications he had had with the King, Ireton's expressions were these: 'He gave us words, and we paid him in his own coin, when we found he had no real intention to the people's good, but to prevail by our factions, to regain by art what he had lost in fight.'" [1]

In regard to this negotiation with the King, Ludlow is by no means to be implicitly relied on.[2] Ludlow, as he informs us himself, had seen the manuscript of Sir John Berkeley's Memoirs, which had been left in the hands of a merchant at Geneva; [3] and he has trusted Berkeley's statements so thoroughly that for many pages his own

[1] Memoirs of Colonel Hutchinson, pp. 304, 305. Bohn's edition. London, 1854.

[2] I will show in a subsequent part of this chapter that he is not to be relied on in several other of his statements against Cromwell.

[3] Ludlow's Memoirs, vol. i. p. 195. Second edition. London, 1721.

Memoirs are merely an echo of Berkeley's, and hence a Royalist writer has assumed that "Berkeley's Memoirs derive confirmation from being incorporated for forty pages into Ludlow's Memoirs, p. 195 to 236."[1] On this point I will quote part of a valuable note of a writer who evidently devoted much time and labour to the study of the history of those times. Of the information Berkeley says he obtained respecting the state of things as regarded the relation of Cromwell and Ireton to the army at this point of time, this writer says: "There is every reason to believe either that Berkeley had been deceived, or that, as his Memoirs were drawn up for a purpose, he, whose faculty of invention was considerable, had embellished. . . . Ludlow, who was sufficiently inflamed against Cromwell, takes up the story from Berkeley, with the history of whose Memoir he was unacquainted. But had it been true, Ludlow must have learned it elsewhere; and Mrs. Hutchinson and others, whose accounts contradict it, must have been aware of it." In the same note it is also said, I think truly: "The propositions drawn by Ireton had accorded with the feelings of the bulk of the army; and it is evident from Berkeley's own statement, that Cromwell had never agreed to any other. His character had indeed been aspersed with the charge of betraying his trust for his own promotion; and it was necessary to remove that imputation, which possibly Hugh Peters, as Berkeley affirms, assisted in doing. This had arisen from his treating too long; but he had now discovered the intrigues of Charles, and he would most likely assign his credulity as the cause of having so long continued the negotiation. Had he avowed other ends,

[1] Memoir of Henry Ireton, p. 146, note, in the Family Library, No. 31, written, I think, by Mr. J. G. Lockhart.

he could not afterwards have been trusted; and the fact would have been handed down to us on indisputable authority."[1]

In justice to Cromwell, and "to speak the truth of all," as Mrs. Hutchinson says in the passage just quoted, I consider it my duty to say here that I am now inclined to think that in my "History of the Commonwealth" I have given too much weight to the pamphlets of John Lilburne as regards the character of Cromwell before his expulsion of the Parliament, for of that act of Cromwell and its consequences—the fatal consequences of a great crime committed by a great man—I see no reason to alter my opinion in any degree. There is a passage in Mr. Brodie's History which throws a very important light on this subject. Unfortunately Mr. Brodie has omitted to state his authority for his statement. But I have always found Mr. Brodie so careful and conscientious in his historical statements, though sometimes he seems to have forgotten to give his historical references with the degree of care and precision which I think desirable, that I am disposed to accept his statement here, convinced that he has not made it without sufficient authority. The statement of Mr. Brodie is this: "The famous John Lilburne, now (1647) lieutenant-colonel of a regiment, having been committed to Newgate for publishing a seditious book, was confined in the same cell with Sir Lewis Dives, the brother-in-law of Digby, who, conceiving it to be for the King's advantage to sever Cromwell from both Parliament and army, zealously infused into the mind of his fellow-prisoner suspicions of Cromwell's having been

[1] A History of the British Empire from the Accession of Charles I. to the Restoration. By George Brodie, Esq., Advocate. Four vols. 8vo. Edinburgh, 1822. Vol. iv. p. 114, *note*.

bought over, speaking as if he had received his intelligence from his friends about the King; and Lilburne daily published pamphlets on the subject. As nothing could be more fatal to the ambitious hopes of the Presbyterians than an agreement between the King and the army, they most eagerly inculcated the charge; and Cromwell himself told Berkeley that he had traced a story to the Countess of Carlisle, a Presbyterian—that he had been promised the vacant title of Earl of Essex, and the post of Commander of the Guard; and that her Ladyship had alleged she had received her intelligence from Berkeley himself. By Berkeley we are assured of the groundlessness of the story; but it answered the full object of the inventors, in inflaming the public mind against Cromwell, and also against his son-in-law, Ireton, who was likewise alleged to have been bribed by a promise of the lieutenancy of Ireland."[1]

It would be a waste of time to deal in detail with the calumnies, large or small, and the feeble sophistries of Sir Philip Warwick, Mr. Denzil Holles, and "such small deer;" but Hobbes, though as a witness he had no personal knowledge of the matters and persons he treated of, had a mind of another order, and the power of his understanding, when he gave it fair play, was such that many might be led, from a knowledge of his metaphysical speculations, to attach to his political and historical writings a weight and value which they do not possess. When I say that Hobbes had no personal knowledge of the matters and persons he treated of, I mean that he had no personal knowledge of Cromwell and Ireton, and of their negotiations with King Charles. For having been for a time amanuensis to Bacon, and also for a time mathematical

[1] Brodie's History of the British Empire, iv. 104, 105. Edinburgh, 1822.

tutor to Charles II. (though if Wallis,[1] the Oxford mathematical professor with whom Hobbes had a long mathematical controversy, was right, Charles II. could not have learned much mathematics from his mathematical tutor), Hobbes must have had some personal knowledge of King James, the great model whose vices Bacon copied, and of King James's representative, Charles II. Hobbes must have known that he was not writing the truth when he wrote that the cause of the wars between King Charles and the Parliament was that "the people were corrupted generally, and disobedient persons esteemed the best patriots."[2] Notwithstanding the reaction in favour of Hobbes, and notwithstanding the fact that "Hobbes is a great name in philosophy," in politics and, when I consider his application above cited of the word "corrupted," not to those to whom it belonged, but to the people who rose in arms against the tyranny and vices of the "corrupted" Court, I may add, in morals Hobbes was a supple slave corrupted by his constitutional timidity, which made him abhor the very idea of resistance, for resistance implied war, and war implied "no arts, no letters, no society, and, which is worst of all, continual fear and danger of violent death."[3]

It is remarkable too that Hobbes seems to have wilfully shut his eyes to the truth of history. There were materials enough accessible even then for a knowledge of the government of Philip II., of Catherine de' Medici, and her sons, Charles IX. and Henry III., of which government the first principle was "the science of reigning is

[1] Wallis said of something, that it was as difficult as it was to make Mr. Hobbes understand mathematics.

[2] Behemoth; or, The Epitome of the Civil Wars of England, p. 3. London, 1682.

[3] Leviathan, part i. c. 13.

the science of lying." Could Hobbes really be ignorant what James I. meant by kingcraft, which he loved to talk of as a thing to be very proud of? And yet Hobbes writes as if he thought or at least sought to make it be believed that in the dealings between the King and the Parliament, the King was honourable in his dealings, while the Parliament acted like a gamester who uses false dice and packing of cards.[1] There is much art in the way he puts it—with a tone of ingenuousness and scorn of trickery, of "knavery and ignoble shifts;" as if his hero, King Charles, were the very model of an honourable man, to whom his word was a law, and who above all things loved truth and justice, and who, such matters as the Aberdeen massacre being kept out of sight, was so fond of his people and "the peace and happiness of the three kingdoms."[2] The good King was a man of great ability also; and it was only by unfair play, "by the advantage of false dice and packing of cards," that the "disobedient persons" got the better of him. Of course Hobbes trusted to the general ignorance which then prevailed respecting the real character of kings and queens, and princes and princesses; of whom the people knew nothing but that they were under the especial care of Providence, from whence they derived, among other miraculous gifts, the power of curing by touch "the King's Evil."

In accordance with all this, Cromwell in the pages of Hobbes would be, like Gan, "traditor prima che nato." And Ireton of course would fare no better—he could hardly fare worse. Hobbes gives no authorities for his assertions, but writes as if he had seen everything with an

[1] Behemoth, p. 62.

[2] Ibid., p. 3. The philanthropy of these royal pets of Hobbes had a certain resemblance to the benevolence towards cats of the individual who kept a number of fine cats in order to make cat-pie of them.

all-seeing and infallible eye. "Cromwell," he says, "and his son-in-law, Commissary-General Ireton, as good at contriving as himself, and at speaking and writing better, contrives how to mutiny[1] the army against the Parliament. To this end they spread a whisper through the army, that the Parliament, now they had the King, intended to disband them, to cheat them of their arrears, and to send them into Ireland to be destroyed by the Irish."[2] This, it will be observed, is told by Hobbes in a manner so artfully false as to convey the impression to any one not knowing the facts, that the Presbyterians had really given no ground to suppose that they intended to disband the army and to cheat them out of their pay, and that the whole story was an invention of Cromwell's and Ireton's. Hobbes thus continues: "The army being herewith enraged, were taught by Ireton to erect a council amongst themselves, of two soldiers out of every troop and every company, to consult for the good of the army, and to assist at the council of war, and to advise for the peace and safety of the kingdom. These were called adjutators, so that whatever Cromwell would have to be done, he needed nothing to make them do it; but secretly to put it into the head of these adjutators. The effect of the first consultation was, to take the King from Holmeby, and to bring him to the army."[3]

[1] Johnson, who gives many words in his Dictionary on the authority of such writers as Bramhall and Gauden, never cites Hobbes, a somewhat better authority for good English; and consequently the word "mutiny" does not appear in his Dictionary as a verb active, although he gives the word "appetible," for which Bramhall is the only authority—Bramhall of whom Hobbes says, "For his elocution, the virtue whereof lieth not in the flux of words but in perspicuity; it is the same language with that of the kingdom of darkness." See "The Question concerning Liberty, Necessity, and Chance, clearly stated and debated between Dr. Bramhall, Bishop of Derry, and Thomas Hobbes, of Malmesbury." London, 1656.

[2] Behemoth, p. 225.

[3] Ibid.

Hobbes speaks with as much confidence as if he had been present among the adjutators. How otherwise could he know that to bring the King to the army was the effect of the first consultation, and not of the second, the third, or any other? It is strange that Hobbes and Hume, who as philosophers knew and admitted that philosophical truth was very difficult to come at, went to the opposite extreme in regard to historical truth, and gave themselves no further trouble about it than to take hold of the first assertion that suited their purpose.

Hobbes goes on thus: "This was the first trick Cromwell played, whereby he thought himself to have gotten so great an advantage, that he said openly, that he had the Parliament in his pocket, and the city too."[1] When did Cromwell say this, and in whose hearing? Hobbes is silent on these points. He goes on: "Cromwell promised the King, in a serious and seeming passionate manner, to restore him to his right against the Parliament. . . . He was resolved to march up to the city and Parliament to set up the King again, and be the second man, unless in the attempt he found better hope, than yet he had, to make himself the first man by dispossessing the King."[2] Hobbes goes on thus a page or two farther on: "Cromwell's main end was to set himself in the King's place. The restoring of the King was but a reserve against the Parliament, which being in his pocket, he had no more need of the King, who was now an impediment to him." To keep him in the army was a trouble; to let him fall into the hands of the Presbyterians had been a stop to his hopes; to murder him privately (besides the horror of the act) now whilst he was no more than lieutenant-general, would have made him odious without furthering his design. There was

[1] Behemoth, p. 226. [2] Ibid., p. 227.

nothing better for his purpose than to let him escape from Hampton Court (where he was too near the Parliament) whither he pleased beyond sea."[1]

All this, told in Hobbes's writing, at once concise and luminous, seems a very clear and simple account of Cromwell's character and actions. The only objection to it is that it is not true. It is strange, I may say again, that Hobbes and Hume, who knew that Nature has made her secrets by no means easy to be discovered, should have imagined that the same Nature made the human character a very simple and easy, instead of a very complicated and difficult subject. The kings of Hobbes and Hume are all, or very nearly all, painted white; and those who resisted the tyranny of their kings are all painted black. Cromwell himself would have wished the picture of his mind to be a likeness, though an unfavourable likeness, even as he told Lely not to leave out scars and wrinkles in the portrait of his face, which he was content to see "marked with all the blemishes which had been put on it by time, by war, by sleepless nights, by anxiety, perhaps by remorse, but with valour, policy, authority, and public care written in all its princely lines."[2] As Macaulay has said of Warren Hastings, "He must have known that there were dark spots on his fame. He might also have felt with pride that the splendour of his fame would bear many spots." He must have known that he who had created an army to destroy the pretensions of tyrants who murdered, and claimed a divine right to murder, men, women, and children, as King Charles' lieutenant did at Aberdeen, would leave a name more famous and more honoured than that of any king—save such a king as Alfred or Robert Bruce. Did he then

[1] Behemoth, p. 234.

[2] Macaulay's Essay on Warren Hastings.

ever desire to make himself a king? and if he did, why did he make such a lamentable mistake? That is indeed the difficulty—the "knot in the withe"—which rendered it possible for such writers as Hobbes and Hume to describe him as made up from the first only of hypocrite and rogue.

I believe that Mrs. Hutchinson's statement quoted above, that "Cromwell was at that time incorruptibly faithful to his trust and to the people's interest,"[1] is perfectly true. Even Berkeley states that the story of the earldom was an invention. Cromwell himself told Berkeley that Lady Carlisle[2] had propagated a report that he was to be made Earl of Essex and Captain of the Guard to the King: and Holles states in his Memoirs that it was affirmed Cromwell was to be a Knight of the Garter; his son to be of the Bedchamber to the Prince; and Ireton to have some great office in Ireland. All these rumours were calumnies invented by the Royalists and Presbyterians for the purpose

[1] Memoirs of Colonel Hutchinson, p. 304.

[2] The third of the Articles of Impeachment brought by the Army against Holles and other ten members of the House of Commons is, "That the said Mr. Holles and the others in March, April, May, and June last past, and at other times, in prosecution of their evil designs, have frequently assembled at the Lady Carlisle's lodgings in Whitehall, for holding correspondence with the Queen of England now in France; with an intent to put conditions upon the Parliament, and to bring in the King upon their own terms; and they assured the Queen of £40,000 per annum if she would assist them in their design; and that they would do more for the King than the army would do; and that they would find out some means to destroy the army and their friends."—Parl. Hist., vol. iii. p. 666. The answer to this article, while it denies that "they have all been at her Ladyship's lodgings," admits enough to form a strong ground for what Cromwell told Berkeley—"Only Mr. Holles, Sir Wm. Lewis, and Sir P. Stapylton do acknowledge that by her Ladyship's favour, they have many times waited upon her, both at her own lodgings in Whitehall, and elsewhere, yet never to any such intent and purpose as is in the article most falsely suggested; but only to pay unto her Ladyship that respect which is due unto her (a person of so great honour and desert) from them, and in truth from all others who are wellwishers to the welfare of this kingdom."—Ibid., p. 688.

of destroying by the poison of slander the man whom they had been unable to destroy by the sword. But not only was Cromwell incorruptibly faithful to his trust then, but he was faithful so long after as the battle of Worcester.

The inference drawn by Ludlow[1] from Cromwell's calling the victory at Worcester "a crowning mercy" is quite unwarranted. Cromwell meant no more than to say that their work was done—*finis coronat opus.* There is also a statement of Ludlow—which has been adopted by even eminent modern writers, as indicating on the part of Cromwell a treacherous purpose at the time immediately following the battle of Worcester—that the very next day after the fight at Worcester, Cromwell dismissed and sent home the militia. This is not only a misstatement of the fact, but a confusion of ideas in the mind of Ludlow respecting the very rudiments of government. The power of the militia was that which formed the main dispute between King Charles and the Parliament; and for a very good reason, because it was the principal characteristic of the Sovereign. There is no question that at that particular time the Sovereign in England was the Parliament, of which the Council of State was the Executive, and in that capacity the Council on the 8th of September, five days after the battle of Worcester, ordered the militia to be disbanded in the several counties of England, and their horses and arms to be delivered up; by an order made on Monday the 8th of September 1651. It is also important to call attention to the fact that Cromwell, the Lord-General, was not present at the Council on this occasion—indeed he did not enter London till four days after—and that the members of the Council of State present on this occasion were eleven in

[1] Ludlow's Memoirs, ii. 447. Second edition. London, 1721.

number, two of whom were Bradshaw the President and Sir Henry Vane. The following is the order: "That a letter be written to the several [Commissioners of the] Militias of the Counties in England who have sent forces to the appointed rendezvous upon the occasion of the Scots' army coming into England, to return them thanks, and also to the officers and soldiers, for their great readiness in the public service; and to let them know that they are to disband their forces, and cause the horses and arms to be delivered unto them who set them out."[1] On the following day the Council of State ordered "that Major-General Skippon be desired to dismiss such of the trained bands of London as are upon the guards."[2] On the 10th the Council of State ordered, "That it be referred to the Committee of Scottish and Irish affairs, to consider how the orders of the House, for the disbanding of the forces lately taken into pay, may be put in execution."[3]

Most of the writers on this period of English history have assumed that immediately after the battle of Worcester, Cromwell had made up his mind to turn out the Parliament and make himself king, whether or not with the name of king. As one of the principal evidentiary facts adduced for this assumption—namely, Ludlow's misstatement mentioned above, that Cromwell took upon himself to dismiss the militia immediately after the battle of Worcester—is found not to be a fact at all, I think it can by no means be concluded that Cromwell had at that time made up his mind to pursue such a course, or even that the idea of such a course had entered into his mind at all. I think also that the sincere respect which, by

[1] Order-Book of the Council of State, Monday, September 8, 1651. MS. State Paper Office.

[2] Ibid., Tuesday, September 9, 1651.

[3] Ibid., September 10, 1651.

the concurrent testimony of many witnesses, Cromwell entertained for Ireton's capacity, honesty, and singleness of purpose, tells much in Cromwell's favour, and shows that there was a great deal of good in his nature, mixed up perhaps with something that was not so good.

I have said that Hobbes and Hume painted their kings all white, and those who, like Cromwell, successfully resisted their kings, all black. A reaction has of late years taken place, which has produced a portrait of Cromwell without a blemish; and those who have thus flattered Cromwell in the portrait they have drawn of him, have sneered at Ireton, and set down Ludlow as a blockhead. My own opinion of Ludlow is that he was a brave, an honest, and within certain limits a clear-headed man; and I find that this opinion nearly coincides with Lord Macaulay's, which, as it is short, I will quote here: "His courage was of the truest temper; his understanding strong but narrow. What he saw, he saw clearly; but he saw not much at a glance. In an age of perfidy and levity, he had, amid manifold temptations and dangers, adhered firmly to the principles of his youth. His enemies could not deny that his life had been consistent, and that with the same spirit with which he had stood up against the Stuarts, he had stood up against the Cromwells."[1]

As Ludlow wrote his Memoirs in exile, and long after the time when he was one of the chiefs of the conquering army of the Long Parliament of England, and not only in exile, but constantly threatened with assassination by some of the emissaries of the house of Stuart who succeeded in assassinating his companion in exile, Lisle, and as he, like many others, firmly believed that all these evils of exile and constant danger of assassination were a clear

[1] Macaulay's History of England, iii. 1–26. London, 1864.

consequence of Cromwell's destruction of the Commonwealth of England, he probably antedated, without intentional misrepresentation, the time when he first began to have doubts of Cromwell's sincerity and honesty; for Ludlow, as well as Ireton, owed his appointment in Ireland to Cromwell,[1] and thus it appears that at a time after that at which Ludlow in his Memoirs expresses suspicions of Cromwell, Cromwell gave all his weight and interest to the appointment of two men to a most important command whom he knew to be both firmly opposed to the domination of himself or any one else. As Ireton has suffered more than most of the Commonwealth's men from calumny and misrepresentation, I will endeavour to give from the Memoirs of Ludlow, his companion in arms in Ireland, some account of the true character of the man and his actions.

Henry Ireton was born in 1610, and was the eldest son of German Ireton of Attenton, Esq., in the county of Nottingham. His family was related to that of Colonel Hutchinson, and through them to the Byrons of Newstead. Mrs. Hutchinson mentions that Cromwell, who would thence appear to have been not exempt from the fancy of honour being attached to being "of that Ilk," was desirous of buying a place called Ireton for Major-General Ireton, who had married his daughter.[2] Ireton went to Oxford in 1626, and then removed to the Middle Temple, where, as appears by the Society's books, he entered as a student on the 24th of November 1629; but he was never called to the bar.

What is said of Ireton in the book bearing the title of "Whitelock's Memorials" may be taken for what it is worth.

[1] Ludlow's Memoirs, i. 321, 322. Second edition. London, 1721.
[2] Memoirs of Colonel Hutchinson, p. 324.

It may be observed that the criticism there given of Ireton's "Agreement of the People" is more unfavourable to Ireton than the opinion afterwards given of Ireton after his death; and the difference may have arisen from the fear that the clause in the Agreement excluding practising lawyers from Parliament might be carried out being removed by Ireton's death. Ireton was one of those who had enjoyed the advantage of a legal education—a great advantage to all men who are engaged in public business, whether civil or military, as was proved by such practical statesmen as Julius Cæsar, and indeed the Romans generally. The two passages in Whitelock respecting Ireton are so different that one may well doubt their having been penned by the same person. In the first the words are: "The frame of this 'Agreement of the People' was thought to be, for the most part, made by Commissary-General Ireton, a man full of invention and industry, who had a little knowledge of the law, which led him into the more errors."[1] In the second the words are these: "This gentleman was a person very active, industrious, and stiff in his ways and purposes; he was of good abilities for council as well as action, made much use of his pen, and was very forward to reform the proceedings in law, wherein his having been bred a lawyer was a great help to him. He was stout in the field, and wary and prudent in councils; exceedingly forward as to the business of a Commonwealth. Cromwell had a great opinion of him, and no man could prevail so much, nor order him so far, as Ireton could."[2]

The numerous papers drawn up by Ireton are written in a clear, terse, and masculine style; and display great knowledge and sagacity, as well as a power of making

[1] Whitelock's Memorials, p. 356. [2] Ibid., p. 516.

words a transcript of thought, of which Hobbes himself, so great a master of that power, needs not have been ashamed. The "Representation from His Excellency Sir Thomas Fairfax and the army under his command, humbly tendered to the Parliament, concerning the just and fundamental rights and liberties of themselves and the kingdom,"[1] was chiefly the production of Ireton; and shows that as early as June 1647 those who led the opinions of the army desired, on grounds which are very clearly stated, "that some determinate period of time may be set for the continuance of this and future Parliaments."

The grounds on which this is put are thus stated: "We are so far from designing or complying to have any absolute arbitrary power fixed for continuance in any persons whatsoever, as that, if we might be sure to obtain it, we cannot wish to have it so in the persons of any whom we might best confide in, or who should appear most of our own opinions or principles, or whom we might have most personal assurance of, or interest in." There is then a distinct opinion passed against the supreme power's being "ingrossed for perpetuity into the hands of *any particular person* or party whatsoever." This is meant to be an emphatic protest against the continuance of the present Parliament, as well as against any man's assuming the supreme power, as Cromwell did when he expelled the Parliament by armed men. Now, if the account of the authorship of these papers put forth by the army, which is given in "Whitelock's Memorials," and which says that Ireton "therein was encouraged and assisted by Lieutenant-General Cromwell, his father-in-law, and by Colonel

[1] Printed at Cambridge by Roger Daniel, printer to the University, with the following fiat: "St. Albans, June 14, 1647.—By the appointment of His Excellency Sir Thomas Fairfax, with the officers and soldiery under his command. J. Rushworth, Secretary."—Parl. Hist., iii. 615-625.

Lambert, who had likewise studied in the Inns of Court, and was of a subtle and working brain,"[1] is correct, it follows that Cromwell was or professed to be at that time averse to the perpetuating of the supreme power in any man; that therefore Cromwell's seizing upon that supreme power by force, and treating it so far as his own private property as to assume that he had a right to dispose of it by will, was a direct contradiction of his opinions in June 1647, in this writing deliberately and solemnly expressed. Lambert's subsequent career shows him to have been a man devoid of principle. By the premature death of Ireton, therefore, Cromwell and Lambert were released from the influence or the restraint of a man who—having been assisted by them in those papers, which so clearly set forth the grounds of constitutional government, and being known to both of them as a man not to be turned aside from what he deemed the path of his duty either by interest or fear—formed an obstacle which, if not insurmountable, was at least formidable to any attempt on the part of either to concentrate the supreme power in his own person.

There are some operations related by Ludlow, who was Ireton's second in command in Ireland, which show that Ireton possessed that fertility of resources in difficulties which is one essential quality of military genius. One of these operations was this. On one occasion the principal part of Ireton's forces was separated from the other part by a river, and the difficulty was to secure a communication between the two parts of his army, he having neither boats nor casks sufficient for that purpose. In this emergency he fell upon this expedient. He ordered great quantities of the biggest reeds to be tied up in many little

[1] Whitelock's Memorials, June 16, 1647.

bundles with small cords, and then fastened to two cables that were fixed in the ground on each side of the river, at the distance of about eight or ten yards from each other. "These," says Ludlow, "being covered with wattles, bore troops of horse and companies of foot as well as a bridge arched with stone."[1]

Ludlow says "while the works were finishing against Limerick, Ireton went to visit the garrison of Killalo, and to order a bridge to be made over the river at that place for the better communication of the counties of Tipperary and Clare. I accompanied him in this journey; and having passed all places of danger, he left his guard to refresh themselves, and rode so hard that he spoiled many horses and hazarded some of the men; but he was so diligent in the public service, and so careless of everything that belonged to himself, that he never regarded what clothes or food he used, what hour he went to rest, or what horse he mounted."[2] When Limerick was taken, Ireton went to view the country in order to make a distribution of winter quarters and garrisons. After several days' hard riding among bogs and over rocks, making reconnaissances and ordering garrisons and winter quarters, Ireton was exposed to a violent storm of wind, rain, and snow, by which he "took a very great cold that discovered itself immediately upon his return. But we could not," continues Ludlow, "persuade him to go to bed till he had determined a cause that was before him and the court-martial, touching an officer of the army, who was accused

[1] Ludlow's Memoirs, i. 325. Second edition. London, 1721. Cæsar, in a difficulty on one occasion as to means to pass a river in the face of an enemy, "imperat militibus ut naves faciant cujus generis eum superioribus annis usus Britanniæ docuerat." In these "coracles," which he carried in waggons twenty-two miles from his camp, he effected the passage of his infantry.—Cæsar, De Bello Civili, i. 54.

[2] Ibid., i. 361. Second edition. London, 1721.

of some violence done to the Irish; and as in all cases he carried himself with the utmost impartiality, so he did in this, dismissing the officer, though otherwise a useful man, from his command for the same. The next day we marched towards Clare Castle, and found the way so rocky that we rode near three miles together upon one of them, whereby most of our horses cast their shoes; so that though every troop came provided with horse-shoes, which were delivered to them out of the stores, yet before that day's march was over, a horse-shoe was sold for five shillings. The next morning the Lady Honoria Obryan, daughter to the late Earl of Thomond, being accused of protecting the goods and cattle of the enemy, under pretence that they belonged to her, and thereby abusing the favour of the deputy's safeguard, which he had granted to her, came to him; and being charged by him with it, and told that he expected a more ingenuous carriage from her, she burst out into tears, and assured him, if he would forgive her, that she would never do the like again, desiring me, after the Deputy was withdrawn, to intercede with him for the continuance of his favour to her: which when I acquainted him with, he said, 'As much a cynic as I am, the tears of this woman moved me;' and therefore gave order that his protection should be continued to her. From hence I would have attended him to Limerick; but so much more care did he take of me than of himself, that he would not suffer it; desiring me to go that day, being Saturday, and quarter at Bonratto, a house of the Earl of Thomond's, in order to recover my health" (Ludlow was then suffering from an illness similar to Ireton's), "and to come to him on Monday morning at Limerick. Accordingly I came, and found the Deputy grown worse, having been let blood, and sweating ex-

ceedingly, with a burning fever at the same time. Yet for all this he ceased not to apply himself to the public business, settling garrisons and distributing winter quarters, which was all that remained to be done of the military service for that year. I endeavoured to persuade him, as I had often done before, that his immoderate labours for his country would much impair, if not utterly destroy him; but he had so totally neglected himself during the siege of Limerick, not putting off his clothes all that time, except to change his linen, that the malignant humours which he had contracted wanting room to perspire, became confined to his body, and rendered him more liable to be infected by the contagion. I was unwilling to leave him till I saw the event of his distemper; but he, supposing my family was by this time come to Dublin, would not permit me to stay.... Soon after my arrival at Dublin, the sad news of his death was brought to us."[1]

The following minutes of the Council of State show that if the business of bringing Ireton's body over to England and giving it a magnificent funeral at the public charge originated with "some of General Cromwell's relations, who were not ignorant of his vast designs now on foot,"[2] it had the sanction of the Council of State: "That it be referred to the committee for Irish and Scottish affairs to consider what is fit to be done in reference to the receiving of the corpse of the Lord-Deputy of Ireland, which is to come to Bristol, and also what is fit to be done for the interment thereof."[3] "That a warrant be issued to Mr. Frost to pay unto Mr. Harrison, embroiderer, the sum of £60 for

[1] Ludlow's Memoirs, i. 380–383.

[2] Ibid., i. 384.

[3] Order-Book of the Council of State, Monday, 8th December 1651. MS. State Paper Office.

making coats for the heralds-at-arms, who are to attend the solemnities of the funeral of the late Lord-Deputy of Ireland, upon accompt out of the Council's exigent moneys."[1] "That £400 be paid by Mr. Frost out of the Council's contingencies to Doctor Carteret upon accompt for defraying the charges of the solemnities of the funeral of the late Lord-Deputy of Ireland."[2]

Some later writers have thought with Ludlow that these pompous obsequies of his son-in-law were among the indications, more or less distinct, which now appeared of the aspiring views of Cromwell.[3] Ludlow says, with a mournful eloquence, that if Ireton "could have foreseen what was done, he would certainly have made it his desire that his body might have found a grave where his soul left it; so much did he despise those pompous and expensive vanities; having erected for himself a more glorious monument in the hearts of good men, by his affection to his country, his abilities of mind, his impartial justice, his diligence in the public service, and his other virtues, which were a far greater honour to his memory than a dormitory amongst the ashes of kings."[4]

Even his enemies, for no man can act so conspicuous a part as Ireton did in the transactions of so eventful and stormy a period of history without having many and deadly enemies, admit that Ireton was actuated by other motives than those of personal interest. Up to the last moment of his life of toil, peril, and hardship, no cloud of selfish ambition had ever cast its shadows on his course. While

[1] Order-Book of the Council of State, Tuesday, 6th January 165½.

[2] Ibid., Friday, 9th January 165½.

[3] Memoir of Henry Ireton, in the volume of the Family Library (No. 31) containing the trials of Charles I. and of some of the regicides, p. 172. Third edition. London, 1839.

[4] Ludlow's Memoirs, i. 384. Second edition. London, 1721.

Cromwell willingly received £6500 per annum in land and other provisions from the Parliament, which the Parliament conferred on him "to oblige him by all means possible to the performance of his duty, or to leave him without excuse if he should depart from it,"[1] and then turned round upon them and actually assigned their ingratitude to the army as a reason for destroying them; Ireton refused the only pecuniary grant which was made to him. When the news was brought to him in Ireland that an Act was ordered to be brought in for settling £2000 per annum on him, he said, "They had many just debts, which he desired they would pay before they made any such presents; that he had no need of their land, and therefore would not have it; and that he should be more contented to see them doing the service of the nation than so liberal in disposing of the public treasure."[2] It is just to Ludlow to add here his express declaration in regard to himself. "I can clearly make it appear," he says, "that during the four years I served in Ireland, I expended £4500 of my own estate more than all the pay that I received."[3]

[1] Ludlow's Memoirs, i. p. 371.

[2] Ibid. The word "any" before "such presents" shows that Ireton meant to express his disapproval of the grant to Cromwell.

[3] Ibid., ii. 465.

## CHAPTER XIX.

*STRUGGLE FOR POWER BETWEEN THE PRESBYTERIANS AND THE INDEPENDENTS—THE KING SEIZED BY JOYCE—THE KING'S NEGOTIATIONS AND INTRIGUES—MUTINY IN THE ARMY—QUELLED—THE ARMY MARCHES TO LONDON AND RESTORES THE MEMBERS OF BOTH HOUSES WHO HAD BEEN DRIVEN AWAY BY TUMULTS—THE KING'S FLIGHT TO THE ISLE OF WIGHT.*

HAVING in the preceding chapter endeavoured to clear the characters of Cromwell and Ireton from misrepresentation, I will now relate what I find stated on credible evidence respecting the struggle for power between the Independents and the Presbyterians.

The elections which had been recently made to fill up the vacancies in the House of Commons caused by deaths or disablement for joining the King[1] had added to the power of the Presbyterians in the House, already greater than that of the Independents. Thus in the western districts, particularly Cornwall, where a small number of persons, almost all Royalists, controlled the elections, members were returned who, though hostile both to the Presbyterians and the Independents, threw their weight into the Presbyterian scale in all measures against the army. The Presbyterians were thus much stronger than the Independents in the House of Commons; and in the House of Lords many Peers having been allowed to compound for

[1] See the list and analysis of the House of Commons in the "Old Parliamentary History," ix. 12 *et seq.*, and in the "New Parliamentary History," ii. 597–629.

their pardon with two years' rent, and having resumed their seats, gave the Presbyterians a majority also in the Upper House. But while the Presbyterians were thus stronger in Parliament, the army that had finished the war so triumphantly was mainly composed of Independents. And Holles, with characteristic temper and short-sightedness, while eager to gratify his resentment against the Independents, forgot that he and his friends were not in a condition to pay up the arrears of the army, and that that army and its leaders were not the sort of men against whom it was very safe to attempt injustice.

On the 19th of February $164\frac{6}{7}$, the question of reducing the army was debated in the House of Commons; and it was voted by 158 against 148 that the number of foot kept up should not be greater than what would be sufficient for the keeping up of such garrisons as should be continued.[1] The House then proceeded to order the dismantling the works and garrisons of several cities and towns, and many castles and forts.[2] On the 8th of March the Commons voted "That no member of that House should have any command in the garrisons or forces under Sir Thomas Fairfax. That there be no officer above a colonel: that they should all take the Covenant: that none who had borne arms against the Parliament should be in command: that they should all conform to the Established Church."[3] This last occasioned a debate and a division of the House, but was carried by 136 against 108, showing a Presbyterian majority of 28.[4] These votes were manifestly aimed against Cromwell. They would

[1] Parl. Hist., iii. 558. [2] Ibid.

[3] Ibid. It must be remembered that the "Established Church" here meant not the Church of England, but the Church of the Presbyterians.

[4] Ibid.

also have excluded Ireton, Ludlow, Skippon, Blake, Algernon Sydney, and other leaders of the Independents. In regard to the vote that all should conform to the Established Church, which was then Presbyterian, Cromwell's views have been happily expressed in the answer to the Presbyterian divine put into his mouth by Sir Walter Scott in a work[1] where in many points he has done great injustice to Cromwell. "Sir," said Cromwell, "you may talk of your regular gospel-meals, but a word spoken in season by one whose heart is with your heart, just perhaps when you are riding on to encounter an enemy, or are about to mount a breach, is to the poor spirit like a rasher on the coals, which the hungry shall find preferable to a great banquet, at such times when the full soul loatheth the honeycomb. Nevertheless, although I speak thus in my poor judgment, I would not put force on the conscience of any man, leaving to the learned to follow the learned, and the wise to be instructed by the wise, while poor, simple, wretched souls are not to be denied a drink from the stream which runneth by the way."

Although there was more than twelve months' pay in arrear, it was proposed to allow only seven weeks' pay, and leave the remainder to be settled after the disbanding of the army. The officers and soldiers, who had good grounds for believing that the object was to employ the money for the payment of another army, looked upon this fresh new model of the army as an act of gross injustice to them, inasmuch as it differed from the former new model in two essential particulars—in disbanding an army which had been always victorious, and in disbanding it without the pay to which it was clearly entitled. Moreover, the fact that, notwithstanding the great revenue raised by

[1] Woodstock, chap. xxx.

taxation and sequestration, their wages were unpaid, while many members of Parliament who risked neither life nor limb accumulated large fortunes, was calculated to excite their indignation, the more so from the suspicion that the delay in paying their arrears arose from a deliberate plan to oblige them to live at free quarters, and thus afford a colourable pretence for disbanding them. In a petition to Sir Thomas Fairfax they desired a full indemnity against all indictments at assizes and sessions for such actions as, though not warrantable by law in time of peace, they were enforced unto by the necessity and exigency of the war. They desired that auditors might be speedily appointed to repair to headquarters to audit and state their accounts; and that before the disbanding of the army satisfaction might be given to the petitioners for their arrears, that so the charge, trouble, and loss of time, which otherwise they must necessarily undergo in attendance for attaining of them, might be prevented, they having had experience that many had been reduced to miserable extremity, even almost starved for want of relief, by their tedious attendance. They petitioned also for relief to such as had lost their limbs, and to the widows and children of such as had been slain in the service; that those who had voluntarily served the Parliament in the late wars might not be compelled by press or otherwise to serve as soldiers out of the kingdom; and that till the army should be disbanded some course might be taken for the supply thereof with money, whereby they might be enabled to discharge their quarters, that so they might not for necessary food be beholden to the Parliament's enemies, burthensome to their friends, or oppressive to the districts where they were quartered.[1]

[1] Parl. Hist., iii. 562-567.

When a copy of this petition in which they set forth these reasonable desires was read in Parliament (March 30), the two Houses ordered a declaration to be printed and published of "their high dislike of that petition," which they said "tended to put the army into a distemper and mutiny, to put conditions upon the Parliament, and obstruct the relief of Ireland."[1]

The officers of the army then (on the 27th of April) presented a petition to the House of Commons on behalf of themselves and the soldiers of the army, in vindication of their late representation of their desires to General Fairfax. The force and clearness of this vindication are such that of those who drew it up may be said what has been said of Julius Cæsar, that they wrote with the same spirit with which they fought. The misrepresentations of them and their harmless intentions, they truly say, they cannot but look upon as an act of most sad importance—and such indeed it was—an act the sad consequences of which were to be felt for many generations—an act than which they say nothing could more rejoice their adversaries, nothing more discourage them, who should esteem it the greatest point of honour to stand by the Parliament till the consummation of its work—the removal of every yoke from the people's necks, and the establishment of those good laws it should judge necessary for the Commonwealth. The means they used and the method they took in regard to their petition were, as they conceived, most orderly and inoffensive, proceeding not in the least from distemper, and aiming in no measure at mutiny, nor in any wise to put conditions on the Parliament. For their liberty of petitioning, they know not anything more essential to freedom, without which grievances are remediless and their

[1] Parl. Hist., iii. 567.

condition, most miserable. They hope that by being soldiers they have not lost the capacity of citizens, that in winning the freedom of their brethren they have not lost their own. They instance petitions from officers in the Earl of Essex's and Sir William Waller's army, even whilst they were in arms, which were well received by the House, with a return of thanks; and therefore they hope they shall not be considered as men without the pale of the kingdom, excluded from the fundamental privilege of subjects. The petition, they affirm, took its first rise from amongst the soldiers, and they, the officers, engaged, but in the second place, to regulate the soldiers' proceedings. For the desire of their arrears, necessity, especially of their soldiers, enforced them thereunto: that they had not been mercenary or proposed gain as their end, the speedy ending of a languishing war testified for them, whereby the people were much eased of their taxes, and decayed trade restored to a flourishing condition in all quarters. They left their estates, and many of them their trades and callings, and forsook the contentments of a quiet life for the difficulties of war, after which they hoped that the desires of their hardly-earned wages would have been no unwelcome request, nor distorted into an intention of mutiny. With regard to their obstructing the relief of Ireland, they do not understand wherein, unless is meant their expression of their desire that those who have served voluntarily should not be pressed to go out of the kingdom. They, however, declare their readiness to embark for Ireland provided their arrears are paid.[1]

When this petition and vindication were presented and read in the House, a great debate ensued thereupon. Some moved that the petitioners might be declared trai-

[1] Parl. Hist., iii. 568-571.

tors. Others proposed the securing of Lieutenant-General Cromwell on the ground that he had underhand countenanced this proceeding. The Presbyterian party, whose power and importance were checked and overshadowed by the military exploits of Cromwell, had long aimed at his destruction, and they now hoped to effect it by sending him to the Tower on a vamped-up charge of instigating the troops to mutiny, and then taking advantage of his confinement, to break the army which had beaten the Royalists and undo all that had been done to deliver England from the tyranny of the Stuarts. But Cromwell being apprised of their designs, went that afternoon towards the army, so that they missed their blow at him. The debate continued till late in the night, and when the House, wearied with long sitting, was grown thin, Mr. Denzil Holles, taking that opportunity, drew up a resolution upon his knee, which was passed, declaring the petition to be seditious, and those to be traitors who should endeavour to promote it after a certain day, and promising pardon to all concerned therein if they should desist by the time limited.[1] Holles, in his own account of the proceeding, while he inveighs in his usual style against the army, does not say a word in answer to the argument that before Parliament commenced any measures of rigour against the army, it ought, both in justice and policy, to have paid up their arrears and satisfied their other just demands.[2] But Holles, by his intemperate and weak

[1] Ludlow's Memoirs, i. 191. Second edition. London, 1721. Ludlow says just before, "The Parliament were highly displeased with the carriage of the army, . . . and some menacing expressions falling from some of them, Lieutenant-General Cromwell took the occasion to whisper me in the ear, saying, 'These men will never leave till the army pull them out by the ears.'" —Ibid., i. 189.

[2] Holles's Memoirs, pp. 84, 89.

policy, only defeated more surely the design he had long entertained of dissolving this army, that he and his party, the Presbyterians, might recover the command of the sword, which they had proved themselves so incapable of wielding with effect. Even Rapin, himself a Presbyterian, pronounces the condemnation of these Presbyterians while he is labouring at their defence, and sums up their character in a very few words when he says, "They thought themselves in slavery if themselves did not command."[1]

It thus appears that in the beginning of their quarrel with the army the Presbyterian majority in the Parliament had clearly placed themselves in the wrong—a result to be looked for when the Presbyterian leaders were such men as Denzil Holles, and the leaders of the Independents were St. John and Vane in the House of Commons, Cromwell and Ireton in the army.

The assertion of Hobbes, that the discontent of the army was entirely the work of Cromwell and Ireton, who, says Hobbes, "to this end spread a whisper through the army that the Parliament, now they had the King, intended to disband them, to cheat them of their arrears, and to send them into Ireland to be destroyed by the Irish,"[2] is the assertion of a man who knew nothing about that remarkable body of men the Parliamentary army of England. No "whisper" was needed. The votes of the Parliament were communicated to the army by their general, Sir Thomas Fairfax; and the Parliamentary soldiers being generally men of intelligence and education, could see as well as any person who reads the two or three pages of this history preceding this page, what measure of justice

[1] Rapin, ii. 624. And see Mrs. Hutchinson's Memoirs, pp. 293–295. Bohn's edition. London, 1854.

[2] Behemoth, p. 225.

the Presbyterian majority of Parliament intended to mete out to the army. The paper presented to Sir Thomas Fairfax by his council of war convened by him at Bury the 29th of May 1647, in relation to the votes of Parliament communicated unto them by His Excellency, and his desire of their advice thereupon,[1] says in reference to these false statements made at the time by the Royalists and Presbyterians, and afterwards turned into history by such historians as Clarendon, Hobbes, and Hume: "And this [a general rendezvous of the army] we advise and desire the rather, because of the scandalous suggestions of some, importing as if the late discontents appearing in the army, and the representation of grievances, were not really in or from the body of the soldiery; but a mere delusion and appearance, made by the contrivance and artifice of some factious officers, or some other persons in the army; the truth or falsehood whereof, as also the true distemper or disposition of the army, your Excellency and all others may most clearly discover, by such a general rendezvous, without delay or trouble of going to every regiment apart as they now lie; the army may more certainly understand what they may expect from the Parliament; and both Parliament and kingdom know what to judge and to trust to concerning the army: and to that purpose, at such a rendezvous, we shall (we hope through the grace of God) discharge our duties to the Parliament and the kingdom, as well as to your Excellency and the army; and demonstrate that the good and quiet of the kingdom is much dearer to us than any particular concernments of our own."[2] The falsehood of the statement or suggestion or insinuation of Hobbes and the other Royalist and Presbyterian writers is further made manifest by the letter of General

[1] Parl. Hist., iii. 585. [2] Ibid., iii. 586, 587.

Fairfax to the Irish Committee concerning disbanding the army, in answer to the last orders of Parliament sent to him, which accompanied the paper from the council of war above quoted. Sir Thomas Fairfax says, "My lords and gentlemen, yesterday, towards evening, I received your lordships' letter, and votes therein enclosed: before the receipt thereof I had convened the officers unto a general council of war, to advise concerning the better transacting of that business, and prevention of all inconveniences; whereupon, after much time spent about it, we came to these resolutions, which declare much dissatisfaction in the army at being disbanded without having their grievances fully redressed; and the danger that may ensue if any one regiment should be drawn out to disband, before the whole army be equally satisfied."[1]

The whole of Hobbes's treatment of this subject proceeds on the assumption that the soldiers of the Parliamentary army were like the soldiers of other armies, mere mercenaries who could be treated altogether as machines. But though as regarded military discipline the army of the Parliament became under Cromwell's management a most perfect machine, on the subjects both of religion and politics the soldiers of that army refused to submit their judgments to the control of either King or commander, priest or prophet. These soldiers being for the most part freeholders, yeomen, farmers, and tradesmen, with fervent religious feelings, and acute and by no means uninformed minds,[2] who had taken up arms for the deliverance of their

[1] Parl. Hist., iii. 584, 585.

[2] Richard Baxter, who was for two years chaplain to Whalley's regiment, which stood high for discipline and valour, informs us that the minds of the soldiers were more influenced by reading books and pamphlets than by hearing sermons. This did not meet with Baxter's approval. He says that the soldiers "being usually disperst in their quarters"—that is, scattered so

souls from such tyrants as Laud, and of their bodies and estates from such tyrants as Charles and Strafford, now felt the necessity of acting for themselves. They refused to be treated as mercenaries and machines. They insisted —and this fact of itself, though it may seem small, marks their importance—on being called "private soldiers, for they would no longer be called common soldiers."[1] They held consultations, elected deputies, and established those "singular councils of adjutators[2] which afterwards gave them such prodigious influence—which controlled their officers when they disagreed with them—and which gave them an ardent, energetic support while their objects agreed, such as could not have been derived from men coldly obeying the orders of a despotic commander."[3] These were the men, the representatives of the best portion of the people of England, who really sealed the

that it was difficult to get together a large congregation of them at a time to hear a sermon—"had such books to read when they had none to contradict them."—Richard Baxter's Autobiography, part i. p. 53, folio. London, 1696. Among other characteristic descriptions of these Puritan soldiers, Baxter gives a sketch in outline of a public disputation held in the church when they were quartered at Agmondesham in Buckinghamshire, between some of the troops and some sectaries, which lasted from morning till almost night, before a crowded congregation.—Ibid., part i. p. 56.

[1] Ludlow's Memoirs, i. 192. Second edition. London, 1721.

[2] The body of adjutators (a word which has been converted or corrupted into agitators) was at first composed of two soldiers out of every troop and every company. But this body being found too numerous for a deliberative council, afterwards acted as electors, and chose two or more representatives, either soldiers or subalterns, for each regiment. Berry, one of the captains of Cromwell's first regiment of horse, and afterwards one of his major-generals, who had been a clerk in an ironwork, and a friend in early life of Richard Baxter, became President of the Council of Adjutators. Two other officers, Ayres and Desborough, who both took service with Cromwell when he first engaged in the war, and one of whom, Desborough, had married a sister of Cromwell's, were said to have had great influence with the adjutators.

[3] Memoir of Henry Ireton, p. 140, written, I think, by J. G. Lockhart, contained in the volume of the Family Library entitled "The Trial of Charles I." Third edition. London, John Murray, Albemarle Street, 1839.

doom of Charles I. These men knew from personal encounter the cruelties and butcheries which the people of England had suffered from the King and his instruments, and they had heard of still greater atrocities that had been committed for him in Ireland and Scotland. They had heard of the wail of agony that rose from Aberdeen on that Sunday when Montrose let loose his bloodhounds on the defenceless citizens of Aberdeen, even as some seventy years before, in the words of a letter quoted by Mr. Motley,[1] "a wail of agony was heard above Zutphen last Sunday, a sound as of a mighty massacre," when at the command of another crowned tyrant the citizens of Zutphen fell a defenceless prey to the bloodhounds of Alva; "some being stabbed in the streets, some hanged on the trees which decorated the city, some stripped stark naked and turned out into the fields to freeze to death in the wintry night—some tied two and two back to back and drowned like dogs in the river Yssel, some hung upon the gallows by the feet—while the outrages upon women were no less universal than in every city captured by the Spanish troops."[2] All this these soldiers of Cromwell were intelligent and reflecting enough to ponder over and discuss among themselves, and they were determined that one of those royal murderers by wholesale and divine right having fallen into their hands, should never get out of them again alive, but should be made a terrible and memorable example to his successors for ever.

The matter stood thus. One set of Presbyterians, the

[1] Motley's Rise of the Dutch Republic, ii. 356. London, 1861. A like sound was heard when Philip's soldiers under Farnese surprised Maestricht, and, as usual with them, soon turned a battle into a massacre, and "a cry of agony arose which was distinctly heard at the distance of a league."—Ibid., iii. 324.

[2] Ibid., ii. 355.

Scots, to whom the King had gone and given himself up, had sold him to another set of Presbyterians, the English Presbyterians, who formed a majority of the English Parliament, and who wished to get rid of the army, and also of the debt they owed the army in the shape of arrears of pay. The army, even if much less intelligent than it was, was not likely to submit to this. The adjutators or agitators of the army knew well enough that the King's being in the power of either of these bodies of Presbyterians was the doing of themselves, of the army who had beaten all the armies this King had brought against them. They therefore came very naturally to the conclusion that he was a prisoner of war—the captive of their bow and of their spear—that he as such prisoner of war belonged to them to deal with him according to the justice that belonged to the case. To put to death prisoners of war who have carried on war in a manner not inconsistent with the usages of nations that had attained the very moderate measure of humanity and civilisation which was attainable in that seventeenth century was reckoned contrary to the law of nations as then understood. But it is quite manifest to the most careless reader or observer of the course of events at that time that this King had not carried on war with even the very moderate measure of humanity that was considered requisite at that time. The treatment of Aberdeen is alone sufficient to prove this. If it be said that Aberdeen was not within the jurisdiction of the English Parliament, it may be answered that the war against Aberdeen was but a branch of the war which had for years been desolating Britain in order that this man who said he had a commission from Heaven, and that his person was sacred, might oppress and plunder at his pleasure the people of Britain. These military Puritans, who abhorred the vices of this

King's predecessor as much as they abhorred this King's tyranny, cruelty, and falsehood, now consulted how to obtain possession of his person, and thus take him out of the hands of the Presbyterians. The result of their consultation soon appeared.

On the 3d of June 1647, about one o'clock in the morning, a party of horse (some accounts say they were 700, others 1000 strong), commanded by Joyce,[1] "cornet to the General's life-guard,"[2] surrounded Holdenby House.[3] "It passing two of the o'clock," say the Commissioners in their letter to the Speaker of the House of Lords, "about break of the day we discovered a party of horse drawn up before the great gates; whereupon we dismissed the officers of our guards to their charges, and immediately, at our back-yard, where our horse and dragoons stood, their horse,

[1] The statement of the Parliamentary Commissioners is that at first it was answered to their demand to speak with their chief officer, "that there was none that commanded them; but soon after, Mr. Joyce, cornet to the General's life-guard, came unto us."—Parl. Hist., iii. 590. According to Clarendon (v. 47), Joyce would appear to have been one of those "mean tradesmen" whose pedigree so much excited the scorn and indignation of Lord Holles, having been, it is said, a tailor. His employment on this occasion on such an important service, whether emanating from his superior officers or the election of his fellow-adjutators in the army, shows what sort of a soldier may be made in a couple of years out of a tailor; for according to Clarendon, his military education could not have been much longer, since he was bred a tailor, and had two or three years before served in a very inferior employment in Mr. Holles's house. This fact, though mentioned by Clarendon, and by Hume after him, for the purpose of showing what a "notable dung-hill"—to borrow the words of Lord Holles—the pedigree of the Parliamentary army was, has a far deeper meaning to those who seek to penetrate the mystery of this great political convulsion.

[2] Letter to the Speaker of the House of Lords, dated Holdenby, June 3, 1647, from the Commissioners attending the King. Printed in Parl. Hist., iii. 589, 590.

[3] Holdenby House in Northamptonshire, built by Sir Christopher Hatton, and at that time a royal mansion, was with other royal mansions at Richmond, Oatlands, Theobalds, &c., pulled down to raise money to pay the arrears of some regiments of the Parliamentary army.—Memoir of Henry Ireton, in the Family Library, p. 136, note.

with many of ours amongst them, entered without any resistance at all, being quietly let in and embraced by the soldiers. We presently sent to speak with their chief officer. It was answered, That there was none that commanded them; but soon after, Mr. Joyce, cornet to the General's life-guard, came unto us; and being demanded the cause of their coming in this manner, he answered, They came with an authority from the soldiery to seize Colonel Greaves, that he might be tried by a council of war, for having scandalised the army; whereby a plot to take away the King (to the end that he might side with that army intended to be raised), and so a second war would be prevented."[1] In a letter dated the following day, June 4, the Commissioners thus continue their narrative: "We should make you a Narrative of Cornet Joyce's admission to speak with the King, after he was in bed last night, when he propounded his going to the army; and also of His Majesty's answer given them in public this morning; the effect was, the King declared he came hither with his own consent, though not so willingly as he might have done, to the end he might send messages to his two Houses of Parliament, the greatest power next himself in England, and to receive answers from them: that he had sent them several messages, and was in short obliged to stay for their answers; yet, being no way able to oppose so many, he should go more or less willingly with them according to the answers they should give him; but withal, required to know by what authority they came unto him. They replied, Their authority was from the army:[2] that they did this of necessity in order to the

[1] Parl. Hist., iii. 590.

[2] Lord Clarendon writes, "That there was no part of the army known to be within twenty miles of Holdenby at that time; and that which administered most cause of apprehension was, that those officers who were of the

peace of the kingdom and maintenance of the laws, which were in great danger of being overthrown by a plot, divers years since contrived amongst persons that had a hand in the present government: and as to the King's demands, which were, that he might be treated with honour and respect; that he might not be forced to anything against his conscience; that his servants against whom they had no just exception might have liberty to attend him; all this they consented to with acclamation."[1]

On the following morning, June 4,[2] at six o'clock, the soldiers being mounted and drawn up in the first court before the house, the King came down, and standing upon the top of the steps, directed his speech to Cornet Joyce, who, representing the commander of the party, stood before the horse at the foot of the stairs. The King said, "That Cornet Joyce having, though at an unseasonable hour of the night, acquainted him that he was come to convey His Majesty to the army, His Majesty according to his promise was there to give his answer in presence of them all; but first he desired to know by whom he was authorised to propound this to His Majesty." Mr. Joyce answered, "That he was sent by authority from the army." The King replied, "That he knew no lawful authority in England but his own, and, next under him, the Parliament;" but withal asked, "Whether he had any authority from Sir Thomas Fairfax; and whether in writing?" It

guard declared 'That the squadron, which was commanded by Joyce, consisted not of soldiers of any one regiment, but were men of several troops and several regiments, drawn together under him, who was not the proper officer;' so that the King did in truth believe that their purpose was to carry him to some place where they might more conveniently murder him" (v. 48).

[1] Parl. Hist., iii. 591, 592.

[2] Ibid., iii. 599.

being replied, "That Sir Thomas Fairfax was a member of the army," the King insisted that he was not answered; Sir Thomas Fairfax, being their general, was not properly a member, but head of the army. Joyce said, "That at least he was included in the army; and that the soldiers present were his commission, being a commanded party out of every regiment." The King replied, "That they might be good witnesses, but he had not seen such a commission before; and if they were his commission, it was an authority very well written, all handsome young men." The King then repeated what he had before said to Joyce, and in reference to Joyce's statement concerning a plot to overthrow the laws of the kingdom, and a design to convey his person to an army newly to be raised for that purpose, the King said, "That he knew not a syllable of any such design or intended army: and that to seek an answer with so many gallant men at his back, were to extort it, which were very unhandsome; besides that, their proposal looked like an opposition to the Parliament, which he desired not, nor would ever infringe the just privileges of the laws of the land: that these reasons induced him not to go willingly; and therefore he desired to know what they intended if he would not go with them." It was answered, "That they hoped His Majesty would not put them to use those means, which otherwise they should be necessitated to, if he refused. For the Commissioners, or any else that refused, they knew well what course to take with them." The King protested, that unless they gave him satisfaction to the reasonable and just demands he should make, he would not go with them, unless they carried him by absolute force; and he thought they would well think upon it before they would lay violent hands upon their King: that the Commissioners

had never put any constraint upon him; they were more civil. Then he propounded, "That he might be used with honour and respect; that they would not force him in anything contrary to his conscience, or his honour; though he hoped he had long ago so fixed his resolutions, that no force could cause him to do a base thing: though they were masters of his body, yet his mind was above their reach."[1] To all those propositions the soldiers consented with a general acclamation; Mr. Joyce adding, "That their principles were not to force any man's conscience, much less the King's." Then His Majesty desired that those who attended him, and some other of his servants, against whom they had no just exceptions, might be permitted to wait upon him. This being agreed, the King asked whither they would have him go. Oxford was first named, then Cambridge. The King named Newmarket, which was agreed to. The King having prepared for his journey, Joyce and his troops conducted him that day as far as Hinchinbrook, and thence on the morrow to Childersley, near Newmarket.[2]

All the evidence, even that of the Royalist writers Warwick, Herbert, and Hobbes, goes to show that the King was at first treated better by the army than he had been by the Parliament's Commissioners. "The King," says Herbert, "was the merriest of the company, having,

[1] It is a pity he did not accord the like privilege to other men's consciences when he and his ministers Laud and Strafford were imprisoning and mutilating and ruining men for acting according to their consciences.

[2] The Narration of what passed betwixt His Majesty and Cornet Joyce, &c., enclosed in the Letter of the Parliamentary Commissioners to the Speaker of the House of Peers, dated Childersley, June 8, 1647. Printed in Parl. Hist., iii. 599-601. This narrative, which we may consider as authentic and authoritative, agrees in the main with the "True and impartial Narration concerning the Army's Preservation of the King," drawn up by Joyce himself, and also with the account of Sir Thomas Herbert in his "Memoirs of the Two last Years of the Reign of King Charles I." London, 1815.

as it seems, a confidence in the army, especially from some of the greatest there, as was imagined." "The deep and bloody-hearted Independents," says Warwick, "all this while used the King very civilly, admit several of his servants, and some of his chaplains to attend him, and to officiate by the service-book. They brought him first to the army to Royston or thereabout; then they remove him to Hatfield, the Earl of Salisbury's house; then to Latimer, and Woborn, and Caversham, the Earl of Craven's house, near Reading."[1] "The King in the meantime," says Hobbes, "till his residence was settled at Hampton Court, was carried from place to place, not without some ostentation; but with much more liberty, and with more respect shown him by far, than when he was in the hands of the Parliament's Commissioners; for his own chaplains were allowed him, and his children, and some friends permitted to see him."[2]

On the 5th of June votes were passed by the Parliament for satisfying the army, and expunging the late declaration against them; and a letter, to be signed by the Speakers of both Houses, was ordered to be sent to Sir Thomas Fairfax, in which they desire the General to appoint a general rendezvous on Wednesday next upon Newmarket Heath; "desiring and expecting that you and your officers will in the meantime so order it, that the army shall neither remove, nor act anything to the disturbance of the public peace."[3] On the 6th of June, however—that is, the next day—the Lords made an order, to which the Commons gave their concurrence, that the Committee for Irish Affairs, sitting at Derby House, should immediately consider of the best ways and means for the ordering

[1] Warwick's Memoirs, p. 301. [2] Behemoth, p. 227.
[3] Parl. Hist., iii. 592, 593.

and directing the forces within the city of London and lines of communication, Middlesex, Surrey, Hertfordshire, and Kent; which showed that they were under great apprehensions of the army's marching up to London."[1]

On the same 5th of June, while the Parliament were employed as mentioned above, a paper was read, agreed to, and subscribed by all the officers and soldiers of the several regiments at the general rendezvous near Newmarket. On the title-page of the original edition of this paper is this indorsement: "It is my desire that the humble representation of the dissatisfactions of the army, together with their engagement, be forthwith printed and published. Given under my hand the 8th day of June 1647.—T. Fairfax."[2] In this paper an authorised account, since it is indorsed by the general commanding, is given of the rise of the organised body of army agitators (so the word is spelt in this paper) in these words: "And whereas by the aforesaid proceedings" (on the army's petition against being disbanded without having received their arrears of pay), "and the effects thereof, the soldiers of this army, finding themselves so stopped in their due and regular way of making known their just grievances and desires to and by their officers, were enforced to an unusual, but in that case necessary, way of correspondence and agreement amongst themselves; to choose out of the several troops and companies

[1] Parl. Hist., iii. 594.

[2] The title of the paper is, "A Solemn Engagement of the Army, under the Command of His Excellency Sir Thomas Fairfax, with a Declaration of their Resolutions as to Disbanding, &c., read, assented to, and subscribed by all the officers and soldiers of the several regiments at the general rendezvous near Newmarket, June 5, 1647. Printed by Roger Daniel, printer to the University of Cambridge."—Ibid., iii. 604–608.

several men, and those out of their whole number to choose two or more for each regiment, to act in the name and behalf of the whole soldiery of the respective regiments, troops, and companies, in the prosecution of their rights and desires in the said petition; as also of their just vindication and righting in reference to the aforesaid proceedings upon and against the same, who have accordingly acted and done many things to those ends; all which the soldiery do own and approve as their own acts. . . . And whereas the Parliament hath since proceeded to certain resolutions of sudden disbanding the army by pieces; which resolutions being taken, and to be executed before full and equal satisfaction be given to the whole army in any of the grievances; before effectual performance of that satisfaction in part which the preceding votes seemed to promise, as to some of the grievances; and before any consideration at all of some others most material (as by the results of a general council of war on Saturday, May 29, was in general declared, and is now more fully remonstrated in particulars, by a representation thereof agreed upon by us all, [soldiers as well as officers]); we cannot but look upon the said resolutions of disbanding us in such manner, as proceeding from the same malicious and mischievous principles and intentions, and from the like indirect practices of the same persons, abusing the Parliament and us, as the former proceedings against us before mentioned did; and not without cruel and bloody purposes (as some of them have not stuck to declare or intimate), after the body of the army should be disbanded, or the soldiers divided from their officers; then to question, proceed against, and execute their malicious intentions upon all such particular officers and soldiers in the army, as had appeared to act in the premises in behalf of the

army."[1] The following passage further shows the mode of action of the agitators, and shows that it was a recognised and regular, not, as has been commonly imagined, an unrecognised and irregular mode of action: "And whereas, upon a late petition to the General from the Agitators in behalf of the soldiery, grounded upon the preceding considerations, relating to the said Resolutions of disbanding, the said general council of war (to prevent the danger and inconveniences of these disturbances, or tumultuous actings or confluences, which the dissatisfactions and jealousies, thereupon also grounded, were like suddenly to have produced in the army) did advise the General first to contract the quarters of the army, and then to draw the same to an orderly rendezvous for satisfaction of all."[2] They then state their willingness to disband on certain terms thus expressed: "We shall disband when thereunto required by the Parliament, having first such satisfaction and securities in relation to our grievances and desires heretofore presented, and such security that we when disbanded shall not remain subject to the like oppression, injury, or abuse as hath been attempted and put upon us while an army by the same men's continuance in the same credit and power, as shall be agreed upon by a council, to consist of those general officers of the army, who have concurred with the army in the premises, with two commission officers and *two soldiers to be chosen for each regiment*, who have concurred, or shall concur with us in the premises and in this agreement; or by the major part of such of them who shall meet in council for that purpose, when they shall be thereunto called by the General. Secondly, That without such satisfaction and security as aforesaid, we shall not willingly dis-

[1] Parl. Hist., iii. 605, 606.

[2] Ibid., iii. 606.

band or divide, or suffer ourselves to be disbanded or divided."[1]

The words "and two soldiers to be chosen for each regiment," further show the singular nature and organisation of this army, which had been created and disciplined by the genius of Oliver Cromwell; and which Mr. Denzil Holles sought to disband and destroy.

As has been seen, on the 5th of June the army was rendezvoused near Newmarket. Notwithstanding the attempt of the Parliament to prevent the army from coming within forty miles of London, on the 12th of June the army had marched to St. Albans. In a letter to the Speaker of the House of Peers, the Earl of Manchester, Sir T. Fairfax says: "My Lord, the letter from both Houses, concerning the disposing of quarters of the army, so as no part may be within forty miles of London, I received but this morning between nine and ten o'clock: the orders for removing to new quarters about St. Albans were given out yesterday, without any appointment of rendezvous for this day, so as the several regiments are already upon their march, in several ways, from their last quarters to their new, and it is not now possible to stop them. The quarters now assigned, the nearest to London, are twenty miles distant. . . . I shall, for the better ordering of the army, be this night at St. Albans, appointed before for the headquarters; where I shall wait your further resolutions on Monday"[2] (June 14). On the 13th of June, being Sunday, both Houses sat again to do business, when another letter from Sir T. Fairfax, dated St. Albans, June 12, 1647, and addressed to the Speaker of the House of Peers, was read, with two petitions enclosed—one from Norfolk and Suffolk, another from Essex—which prayed

[1] Parl. Hist., iii. 607.

[2] Ibid., iii. 613.

Sir Thomas Fairfax not to disband the army till the general grievances should be redressed.[1] There were petitions from other counties to the same effect.

It is not improbable that those who managed the affairs of the army, seeing themselves thus supported by a certain proportion of the people of England, may have been encouraged thereby to extend their demands beyond payment of their arrears to a general reform of the constitution, government, and laws.[2] They complained, moreover, that the Parliament, while they were using means to deprive the army of their arrears of pay, had, notwithstanding the self-denying ordinance, shared all lucrative offices among their own body, and appropriated to themselves the public money which ought to have been applied to the discharge of the arrears of the soldiers' pay;[3] and they brought a charge or impeachment against eleven members of the House of Commons, of an attempt to overthrow the rights and liberties of the people, and for that purpose unjustly to break the present army and to raise a new force to advance and carry on desperate designs of their own to the prejudice of the Parliament and public.[4] The impeached members were Holles, Stapylton,

[1] Parl. Hist., iii. 614.

[2] See "The Heads of the Proposals agreed upon by His Excellency Sir Thomas Fairfax and his Council of War, August 1, 1647."—Ibid., iii. 738–745.

[3] Parl. Hist., iii. 625, 626, and 664–678.

[4] See particularly in the Charge or Impeachment presented to the Commons in the name of Sir T. Fairfax and the army under his command against Denzil Holles, Esq., and ten other members of the House of Commons, the charge "that the said Mr. Long" (one of the impeached members) "did procure a command of a troop of horse under the late Earl of Essex; but whenever his said troop came upon any service, he, out of fear or treachery, absented himself, and never was seen or known to charge the enemy in person, though his troop often engaged; and when his troop was sent into the west, he took no other notice of it but to receive his pay; and in the meanwhile he repaired into the county of Essex, and procured a commission to be a colonel of horse,

Lewis, Clotworthy, Waller (Sir William), Maynard, Massey, Glynn, Long, Harley, and Nicholl.

There were great debates in the House of Commons for several days together on the subject of the army's charge against the eleven members. The Presbyterian majority refused to suspend them; but upon the army's advance nearer to London (June 26) (from Berkhampstead to Uxbridge, some regiments pushing on to Harrow and Brentford), which they gave out was not to overawe the Parliament or the city, but only to see that the members charged by them should be suspended the House, and that then they would give in a more particular charge with the proofs to make it good against them, the Commons became alarmed, and the eleven members left the House. On the very day the eleven members withdrew, a

and instead of fighting against the Parliament's enemies, he betook himself to plunder and oppress the Parliament's friends there. That the said Mr. Long afterwards, upon pretence of some losses sustained by the enemy, and some great service he had done for the State, did procure of the House a great office in the Chancery; namely, to be the chief Register [*sic*] of that court, wherein his skill was little, and whereof he was, and still is, altogether incapable; and although for a time, upon the self-denying ordinance, he was displaced, yet, upon the motion, or by the power and means, of the said Mr. Holles, he hath obtained the said office again; to the great prejudice of skilful clerks that have been bred up in the said court, to the disservice of the Commonwealth and the dishonour of the House."—Parl. Hist., iii. 676, 677. Mr. Long in his answer denies the charge of cowardice or neglecting his military duties, but admits the charge respecting the "great office in the Chancery."—Ibid., iii. 708–710. It is possible that the charge of cowardice against Mr. Long may be as false as the charge of Clarendon, that Ireton having refused to fight a duel with Holles, Holles pulled Ireton by the nose—a story not considered true even by Royalist writers of moderate candour. But then Ireton being better known had an advantage over Mr. Long, against whom a false charge could not so easily be refuted. Yet Clarendon, though Ireton had proved his courage on many fields of battle, insinuates more than once that he was wanting in courage. Of all the base qualities displayed by Hyde there is none more discreditable than his disposition to make charges of cowardice, which come particularly ill from a man who in all this war never once risked his own person. His charge against Ireton on this occasion is completely disproved in the Memoir of Henry Ireton, before referred to, p. 175.

question for proceeding immediately upon the desires of the army was carried by a majority of 53 against 27; and the next day another question in favour of the army passed by 121 against 85.[1] On July 20 the Commons gave leave to the eleven impeached members to be absent for six months.[2] During his suspension from Parliament Mr. Holles went to France, and it was said, and "by the consequence appeared true, that there meeting with the Queen, he pieced up an ungodly accommodation with her; although he was the man that at the beginning, when some of the more sober men, who foresaw the sad issues of war and victory to either side, were labouring for an accommodation, said openly in the House, that 'he abhorred that word accommodation.'"[3] Once again Denzil Holles makes his appearance in the pages of Mrs. Hutchinson, when the aged matron relates with a mournful severity the scene in the court which sat upon the men who had delivered England from the tyranny of the Stuarts—when she describes the shock to Colonel Hutchinson at the sight of the prisoners, "with whom he believed himself to stand at the bar; and the sight of their judges, among whom was that *vile traitor*[4] [Monk] who had sold the men that trusted him; and he [Holles] that openly said he abhorred the word *accommodation,* when moderate men would have prevented the war; and the colonel's own *dear friend* [Ashley Cooper], who had wished damnation to his soul if he ever suffered penny of any man's estate, or hair of any man's head to be touched."[5] Truly might Sir Henry Vane say, as he said, in his prayer with his family and friends in his prison on the morning of

[1] Parl. Hist., iii. 653, 654.
[2] Ibid., iii. 712.
[3] Memoirs of Colonel Hutchinson, p. 328.
[4] The italics are in the original.
[5] Memoirs of Colonel Hutchinson, p. 417.

his execution, "Oh! what abjuring of light, what treachery, what meanness of spirit has appeared in this day!"

Genius, though it can do things which talent cannot do, is more liable to certain errors than talent—such errors as belong to that impulsive temperament which is often the accompaniment of genius. Bonaparte may have had more genius than Washington, but Bonaparte committed errors which Washington would not have committed; and the ardent, sanguine temperament of Cromwell might sometimes lead him into errors, from which the equally firm but less impulsive nature of Ireton would protect him. Thus in Sir John Berkeley's Memoirs there is a passage (with many pages more of Berkeley's Memoirs incorporated into Ludlow's Memoirs[1]) which, though Cromwell's emotions and tears on this occasion were or might be perfectly sincere and genuine, is one of those cases which may have led to the general charge of hypocrisy and insincerity against Cromwell. Sir John Berkeley says that "Cromwell told him that he had lately seen the tenderest sight that ever his eyes beheld, which was the interview between the King and his children; that he wept plentifully at the remembrance thereof, saying, that never man was so abused as he in his sinister opinion of the King, who, he thought, was the most upright and conscientious of his kingdom: that they of the Independent party had infinite obligations to him, for not consenting to the propositions sent to him at Newcastle, which would have totally ruined them, and which His Majesty's interest seemed to invite him to; concluding with this wish, that God would be pleased to look upon him according to the sincerity of

[1] Ludlow's Memoirs, i. 195–236. Second edition. London, 1721. Ludlow says, "Many particulars relating to this business I have seen in a manuscript written by Sir John Berkeley himself, and left in the hands of a merchant at Geneva."—Ibid., i. 195.

his heart towards the King." It is not surprising that when Berkeley related this scene to the King, "with this relation the King was no more moved than with the rest, firmly believing such expressions to proceed from a necessity that Cromwell and the army had of him, without whom, he said, they could do nothing." [1]

The distinction which I have indicated between Cromwell and Ireton, as in some degree coincident with the distinction between the rapid impulsive action of genius and the more deliberate working of talent, is shown in this statement of Ludlow, borrowed from Berkeley: "Cromwell appeared in all his conferences with Sir John Berkeley most zealous for a speedy agreement with the King, insomuch that he sometimes complained of his son Ireton's slowness in perfecting the proposals, and his unwillingness to come up to His Majesty's sense." [2] Moreover, Ireton would appear to have had less aptitude for becoming, even in the smallest degree, a courtier than Cromwell; and he often spoke with a frankness and honesty not found profitable, and therefore not used by courtiers.

If the many constitutional papers penned by Ireton on behalf of the army were collected, they would form a large volume. His pen was now employed in drawing up the celebrated Heads of Proposals of the army for the future government of England. Among many other proposals were these: That a certain period should be set for the ending of this Parliament, such period to be within a year at most; that Parliaments should be called biennially, each biennial Parliament to sit 120 days certain, unless adjourned or dissolved by their own consent; that neither the Book of Common Prayer nor the Covenant be

[1] Ludlow's Memoirs, i. 199. [2] Ibid., i. 201.

enforced upon any; that the excise be taken off from such commodities whereon the poor people of the land do ordinarily live, and a certain time be limited for taking off the whole; that all monopolies, old or new, and restraints to the freedom of trade be taken off;[1] that the great officers of State be for ten years, nominated by the Parliament, and after ten years the Parliament should nominate three, and out of that number the King should appoint one upon any vacancy; that the making of war or peace with any other kingdom or state shall not be without advice and consent of Parliament; that the King be restored according to the conditions here expressed. There were also provisions as to the matter of compositions. The number of persons excepted from pardon was reduced to "five[2] for the English," not named.

These propositions were more advantageous to the King than those which had been offered him before the commencement of the war, when Denzil Holles, who now denounced the party who offered these terms as levellers, and subverters of all constitutional government, declared that he abhorred the very word accommodation. But Charles had not the least intention of accepting these terms; though Sir John Berkeley, when he brought them to him at Woburn to peruse before they were offered to him in public, and the King expressed himself much displeased with them, answered that a crown so near lost was never recovered so easily as this would be, if things were ad-

[1] See "The Heads of the Proposals agreed upon by His Excellency Sir Thomas Fairfax and his Council of War, August 1, 1647." Parl. Hist., iii. 738–745.

[2] This is the word in the copy of the Proposals given in the "Parliamentary History," iii. 742. In the histories and memoirs the word is "seven," which was probably an original error of Berkeley copied by Ludlow, and then by the whole host of writers who do not look at the original papers.

justed upon these terms. But Charles had no thought of "accommodation" any more than Denzil Holles formerly had, but, on the contrary, was meditating a fresh war upon his people. He would not have hesitated to storm and sack London as his Lieutenant Montrose had stormed and sacked Aberdeen, to attain the power of plundering and oppressing the people of England which had been attained by his royal brother-in-law of plundering and oppressing the people of France. And he was not without encouragement in these royal meditations, notwithstanding the terrible lessons which the Independents had already given him on many fields of battle. Parties the most opposite courted him—the Presbyterians on one side and the Catholics on the other secretly promised him great assistance; and he flattered himself to the last that he might with the assistance of one subdue the rest and rise on the wreck of all, while he should run no risk either in his person or regal dignity. But in all this he was lamentably mistaken; for when, the Proposals being sent to him and his concurrence humbly desired, he, "to the great astonishment not only of Ireton and the officers of the army who were present, but even of his own party, entertained them with very sharp and bitter language,"[1] his doom was sealed; "for Colonel Rainsborough, who of all the army seemed the least to desire an agreement, went out from the conference, and hastened to the army, informing them what entertainment their commissioners and proposals had found with the King."[2] And when Berkeley afterwards asked Ireton and the rest of the officers what they would do if the King accepted the Proposals, he was told plainly that if the King accepted the Proposals, they would offer them to the Parliament; if he rejected them,

[1] Ludlow's Memoirs, i. 204. [2] Ibid., i. 205.

they would not say what they would do. The Proposals were never again offered to the King.

While the King was "entertaining the commissioners of the army with the very sharp and bitter language" above mentioned, Sir John Berkeley taking notice of it, looked with much wonder upon the King, and stepping up to him said in his ear, "Sir, you speak as if you had some secret strength and power which I do not know of; and since you have concealed it from me, I wish you had concealed it from these men also."[1] In fact the King imagined he had some secret strength and power; for while he was negotiating with the army, he was also negotiating with the enemies of the army—that is, with the Presbyterian party (English and Scotch) and the city of London, who had by some strange process of reasoning come to the conclusion that they possessed a power of opposing the army—the Lord Lauderdale and others of the Presbyterian party, and divers of the city of London, pretending to despise the army, and assuring the King that they would oppose the army to the death, when they would not have stood the onset of a single regiment.[2]

The account given above on the authority of Sir John Berkeley, who was present at the conference, is quite sufficient to explain the breaking off of the army's negotiation with the King without the assistance of the story of the

[1] Ludlow's Memoirs, i. 205.

[2] To show how Ludlow has followed Berkeley in this part of his Memoirs, Berkeley's words are, "What with the pleasure of having so concurring a second as Mr. Ashburnham, and what with the encouraging messages which His Majesty had (by my Lord Lauderdale and others) from the Presbyterian party and the city of London, who pretended to despise the army, and to oppose them to death"—and Ludlow's are, "With these encouragements and others from the Presbyterian party, the Lord Lauderdale and divers of the city of London assuring the King that they would oppose the army to the death."—Ludlow's Memoirs, i. 204.

letter from Charles to the Queen, said to have been intercepted by Cromwell and Ireton at the Blue Boar Inn in Holborn. Carte, who had seen the story of this letter in MS., and who published a version of it in his "Life of the Duke of Ormonde," says of it, "Mr. Morrice, chaplain to Roger Earl of Orrery, in some MS. memoirs that he collected of passages which he had heard from the mouth of that nobleman, relates the manner of that discovery with such particular circumstances that (however his memory might fail him in other cases, wherein I find many mistakes as to facts and circumstances of time, place, and persons) what he relates of this matter seems to deserve credit."[1]

The story referred to is related in the Memoir prefixed to the "State Letters of Roger Boyle, first Earl of Orrery," better known by the name of Lord Broghill, and is in some degree confirmed by the testimony of Ashburnham, who says in his Narrative: "Being commanded by His Majesty to desire from Cromwell and Ireton that he might go from Stoke to one of his own houses, they told me, with very severe countenances, he should go if he pleased to Oatlands; but that they had met with sufficient proof that the King had not only abetted and fomented the differences between them and their enemies, by commanding all his party to take conditions under the (then) Parliament and city, but that likewise he had (at that instant) a treaty with the Scots, when he made greatest profession to close

[1] Carte's Ormonde, ii. 12. Carte's Life of the Duke of Ormonde was published in 1736. (London.) Morrice's Memoir of Roger first Earl of Orrery (prefixed to Orrery's State Letters) was published in 1743. (Dublin.) It appears from what is said in Carte's Ormonde, in the same page (ii. 12), that the King's reasons for preferring the Scots were that he should get more from the Scots than from the English army, but he overlooked the fact that the Scots were unable to contend with the army of the English Independents led by Fairfax and Cromwell.

with them: for the justification of which, they affirmed that they had both his and the Queen's letters to make it good, which were great allays to their thoughts of serving him, and did very much justify the general misfortune he lived under of having the reputation of little faith in his dealings."[1]

The story[2] is this. In 1649, after the taking of Waterford, Dungannon, and other places, "Cromwell made Youghall the headquarters; from whence they marched out several times to several places; and one time particularly," says the writer, described in the title-page of the "Collection of the State Letters of Roger Boyle, first Earl of Orrery," as "the Rev. Mr. Thomas Morrice, his Lordship's chaplain," "when Lord Broghill was riding with Cromwell on one side of him and Ireton on the other, at the head of their army, they fell into discourse about the late King's death. Cromwell declared, that if the King had followed his own mind, and had had trusty servants about him, he had fooled them all. And further said, that once they had a mind to have closed with him; but upon something that happened, they fell off from their design again. My Lord, finding Cromwell and Ireton in a good humour, and no other person being within hearing, asked them if he might be so bold as to desire an account, 1st, Why they once would have closed with the King? and 2dly, Why they did not? Cromwell very freely told him he would satisfy him in both his queries. The reason, says he, why we would once have closed with the King, was

[1] Ashburnham's Narrative, being the second volume of the work, in two volumes 8vo, London, 1830, of which the first volume is "A Vindication of John Ashburnham, by his lineal descendant and present representative" (the late Earl of Ashburnham).

[2] The same story is told on the same authority in Carte's Ormonde, ii. 12, already referred to, with only a few slight verbal differences.

this: we found that the Scots and the Presbyterians began to be more powerful than we; and if they made up matters with the King, we should have been left in the lurch: therefore we thought it best to prevent them, by offering first to come in upon any reasonable conditions. But while we were busied in these thoughts, there came a letter from one of our spies, who was of the King's bed-chamber, which acquainted us that on that day our final doom was decreed; that he could not possibly tell what it was, but we might find it out, if we could intercept a letter sent from the King to the Queen, wherein he declared what he would do. The letter, he said, was sewed up in the skirt of a saddle, and the bearer of it would come with the saddle upon his head about ten o'clock that night to the Blue Boar Inn in Holborn, for there he was to take horse and go to Dover with it. This messenger knew nothing of the letter in the saddle, but some persons in Dover did. We were at Windsor when we received this letter; and immediately upon the receipt of it, Ireton and I resolved to take one trusty fellow with us, and with troopers' habits to go to the inn in Holborn; which accordingly we did, and set our man at the gate of the inn, where the wicket only was open, to let people in and out. Our man was to give us notice when any person came there with a saddle, whilst we, in the disguise of common troopers, called for cans of beer, and continued drinking till about ten o'clock: the sentinel at the gate then gave notice that the man with the saddle was come in. Upon this we immediately rose, and, as the man was leading out his horse saddled, came up to him with drawn swords, and told him we were to search all that went in and out there; but as he looked like an honest man, we would only search his saddle, and so dismiss him. Upon

that we ungirt the saddle, and carried it into the stall where we had been drinking, and left the horseman with our sentinel; then, ripping up one of the skirts of the saddle, we there found the letter of which we had been informed; and having got it into our own hands, we delivered the saddle again to the man, telling him he was an honest man, and bidding him go about his business. The man not knowing what had been done, went away to Dover. As soon as we had the letter we opened it; in which we found the King had acquainted the Queen that he was now courted by both factions, the Scotch Presbyterians and the army, and which bid fairest for him should have him; but he thought he should close with the Scots sooner than the other. Upon this, added Cromwell, we took horse, and went to Windsor; and finding we were not likely to have any tolerable terms from the King, we immediately, from that time forward, resolved his ruin."[1]

[1] Memoir of Roger Boyle, the first Earl of Orrery, by the Rev. Mr. Thomas Morrice, his Lordship's chaplain, pp. 26-29, prefixed to vol. i. of Orrery's State Letters, two volumes 8vo, Dublin, 1743. The writer of the "Memoir of Henry Ireton," already referred to, says (p. 154): "That a letter from Charles to Henrietta Maria was intercepted by Cromwell and Ireton at the inn is not improbable; and that its contents were something to the effect which is stated by Lord Broghill seems very credible. The probability appears to be that the account of Lord Orrery's chaplain is erroneous in *making Cromwell assign this letter as the sole cause of their giving up the King.*" The words I have printed in italics convey, I think, a correct view of the matter. The chaplain's or Lord Orrery's memory might have deceived them as to some points. Another version of this letter is given in the following passage of a book called "Richardsoniana," a posthumous publication of Richardson the painter (1776): "Lord Bolingbroke told us—Mr. Pope, Lord Marchmont, and myself (June 12th, 1742)—that Lord Oxford had often told him that he had seen, and had in his hands, an original letter that King Charles I. wrote to the Queen, in answer to one of hers that had been intercepted and then forwarded to him, wherein she had reproached him for having made those villains too great concessions (viz., that Cromwell should be Lieutenant of Ireland for life without account; that that kingdom should be in the hands of the party, with an army there kept which should know no head but the Lieutenant; that Cromwell should

The King having thus broken with the army, as a first step towards a new war used all his influence to strengthen the enemies of the army in the Parliament.[1] To this end a paper entitled "A Solemn Engagement" was circulated for signature, which after reciting that the subscribers

have a garter, &c.) That in this letter of the King's it was said that she should leave *him* to manage, who was better informed of all circumstances than she could be; but she might be entirely easy as to whatever concessions he should make them; for that he should know in due time how to deal with the rogues, who, instead of a silken garter, should be fitted with a hempen cord. So the letter ended: which answer, as they waited for, so they intercepted accordingly,—and it determined his fate. This letter, Lord Oxford said, he had offered £500 for." This version of the letter contains several things which Cromwell might have been disposed to omit in telling the story to Lord Broghill, and may be considered as corroborative rather than infirmative evidence of there having been an important letter intercepted.

Among the innumerable proofs which Time has brought to light of Charles's insincerity, we may mention one in particular which shows the length he was willing to go to establish despotic power in England, and also, that if he has any claim to the title of "martyr," it must be a martyr neither for the laws nor the liberties, nor even for the *Church of England.* The document alluded to is a letter from Charles to the Pope, which Mr. Massingberd found in the Vatican Library, requesting aid from His "Holiness," and, as the fair inference from the terms employed appears to be, expressing a hope that the people of England would be brought over to the Roman Catholic faith.

"'MOST HOLY FATHER,—So many and so great proofs of the fidelity and affection of our cousin the Earl of Glamorgan we have received, and such confidence do we deservedly repose in him, that your Holiness may justly give faith and credence to him in any matter whereupon he is to treat, in our name, with your Holiness, either by himself in person, or by any other.

"'Moreover, whatever shall have been positively settled and determined by him, the same we promise to sanction and perform. In testimony whereof we have written this very brief letter, confirmed by our own hand and seal; and we have in our wishes and prayers nothing before this, that by yr. favour we may be restored into that state in which we may openly avow ourself.—Your very humble and obedient servant, CHARLES R.

"'At our Court at Oxford, October 20,' [1645].

"*Note.*—The original is in the Vatican Library. Charles after his reverses in this year gave the Earl of Glamorgan an unlimited commission to concert measures with His Holiness for the retrieving of his affairs, and the restoring of his estate. The letter is here translated from the Latin, and a similar communication was made by Charles to the Cardinal Spada."—From Halliwell's Letters of the Kings of England, ii. 398.

[1] Ludlow's Memoirs, i. 205–207.

had entered into a solemn league and covenant for reformation and defence of religion, the honour and happiness of the King, and the peace and safety of the three kingdoms of England, Scotland, and Ireland, engaged the subscribers of all degrees—citizens, commanders, officers, and soldiers of the trained bands and auxiliaries; the young men and apprentices of the cities of London and Westminster; seamen and watermen, together with divers other commanders, officers, and soldiers within the lines of communication—to bring the King to his two Houses of Parliament with honour, safety, and freedom, and that without the nearer approach of the army; there to confirm such things as he had granted in his message of the 12th of May last; and that by a personal treaty such things as are yet in difference may be speedily settled, and a firm and lasting peace established.[1] This paper was annexed to a petition of the trained bands, apprentices, mariners, and soldiers for the King's coming to London. This petition was delivered to the Commons on the 24th of July, and a declaration of the Commons, agreed to by the Lords, was sent to the Lord Mayor and Sheriffs with an order to be forthwith read and published by beat of drum and sound of trumpet in the cities of London and Westminster, that all persons joining in the said Engagement shall be deemed guilty of high treason.

Two days after, on the 26th of July, great numbers of apprentices assembled about the House of Commons in a riotous manner. Many of these came into the House of Commons with their hats on, kept the door open, and called out as they stood, "Vote," "vote;" and stood in this insolent manner till the votes had passed for repealing the ordinance for changing the militia, and the declara-

[1] Parl. Hist., iii. 713, 714.

tion of both Houses on the 24th.[1] Ludlow, who was present in the House at the time, describes a scene to which there is probably no parallel in the history of the English Parliament.[2] The next morning Ludlow advised with Sir Arthur Haselrig and others, and they concluded that under the present circumstances they would not sit in Parliament, it being manifestly the design of the other party either to drive them away or to destroy them. They therefore resolved to go to the army for protection, Haselrig undertaking to persuade the Speaker to go, who having caused £1000 to be thrown into his coach, went down to the army, which then lay at Windsor and the adjacent places.[3] As might be supposed, it was not a matter of any difficulty for the army of Fairfax and Cromwell, which had beaten all the armies which the Royalists had brought against it, to beat the London apprentices and the City militia. On the 6th of August Fairfax came to Westminster with the Speakers of both Houses, and the members whom he restored to their seats—nineteen of the Upper and a hundred of the Lower.[4] "Having resumed our places in the House," says Ludlow, "as many of the eleven members as had returned to act, immediately with-

[1] Whitelock's Memorials, p. 263.

[2] "Whilst the two Houses were in debate what answer to give to this insolent multitude, some of them getting to the windows of the House of Lords, threw stones in upon them, and threatened them with worse usage unless they gave them an answer to their liking; others knocked at the door of the House of Commons, requiring to be admitted; but some of us with our swords forced them to retire for the present; and the House resolved to rise without giving any answer, judging it below them to do anything by compulsion. Whereupon the Speaker went out of the House, but being in the lobby was forced back into the chair by the violence of the insolent rabble; whereof above a thousand attended without doors, and about forty or fifty were got into the House. So that it was thought convenient to give way to their rage." —Ludlow's Memoirs, i. 206.

[3] Ibid., i. 207.

[4] Parl. Hist., iii. 745 *et seq.*

drew. . . . A day or two after the restitution of the Parliament, the army marched through the city without offering the least violence, promising to show themselves faithful to the public interest."[1]

We have now arrived at the most perplexing part of our subject—perplexing, for the evidence besides being scanty is very conflicting, the two principal witnesses, Berkeley and Ashburnham, frequently disagreeing with one another; and the words reported by Lord Broghill as used by Cromwell, "we from that time resolved his ruin," being inconsistent with Cromwell's alleged attempt to bring about the King's escape from the power of the adjutators of the army, who, though they had been induced to assent to a negotiation with the King, now upon the failure of it had become more determined in their hostility to him than ever. "The adjutators," says Ludlow, who, as a member both of the Parliament and of the army, may be regarded as a credible witness on this point, "began to complain openly in Council both of the King and the malignants about him, saying that since the King had rejected their Proposals, they were not engaged any further to him, and that they were now to consult their own safety and the public good; that having the power devolved upon them by the decision of the sword, to which both parties had appealed, and being convinced that monarchy was inconsistent with the prosperity of the nation, they resolved to use their endeavours to reduce the government of England to the form of a commonwealth."[2] So far Ludlow may be correct, but when he then goes on to say that these proceedings "struck great terror into Cromwell and Ireton," he shows himself to be misled by his too great confidence in Berkeley's state-

[1] Ludlow's Memoirs, i. 210, 211.

[2] Ibid., i. 213.

ments. For Ludlow has, as has been shown in the preceding chapter, given so high a character of Ireton for honesty and singleness of purpose that he could not, without contradicting himself, mean here terror in Cromwell and Ireton for their own safety, in consequence of their dealings with the King having not been strictly honest towards the army; for the declaration of the adjutators against a monarchy and for a commonwealth could have struck no terror into Ireton, who held the same opinions. Ludlow might indeed mean by the words "struck great terror," that Cromwell and Ireton, in taking upon them so active a part as they had taken in drawing up the Proposals for restoring the King on certain conditions, and in carrying on the negotiations they had carried on both with the King personally and with his confidential agents Berkeley and Ashburnham, ran very considerable personal risk from the jealousy of the adjutators, who had taken up a dislike, rising almost to detestation, of monarchy in general, and of the dynasty of the Stuarts in particular; and whose suspicions of Cromwell, as, according to Berkeley, Cromwell told him and Ashburnham, were grown to that height that he was afraid to lie in his own quarters. This must mean that he thought some of the most violent, such as John Lilburne and Wildman, as is intimated by Holles and Berkeley, had formed a plot to assassinate him as a renegade to the cause of liberty.

This indeed was the most hopeful scheme that the Royalists and Presbyterians had devised for effecting their objects. If they could but have got rid in any way of the man who had created that army for the Parliament, and under whose management it was a machine so perfect that it never failed to do the work given it to do, they might

hope that the machine would not work without its creator's superintendence, that the army would fall to pieces, or by mismanagement would encounter defeat, which it had never encountered under Cromwell. John Lilburne had, as has been mentioned in the last chapter, been committed to Newgate for publishing a seditious book, and had been confined in the same cell with Sir Lewis Dives, a brother-in-law of Digby; and Dives seeing how much it would be for the King's advantage to sever Cromwell from both the Parliament and the army, had zealously infused into the mind of Lilburne suspicions of Cromwell's having been bought over; pretending to have received his intelligence from his friends about the King; and Lilburne daily published pamphlets in his violent inflammatory style against Cromwell. The Presbyterians most eagerly took up the charge; and Cromwell himself told Berkeley that he had traced the story about his having been promised the title of Earl of Essex and the post of Commander of the Guard to the Countess of Carlisle, a woman, to borrow Hyde's lofty phrase, "of a very noble extraction," being a daughter of the Earl of Northumberland, who had been married when young to one of King James's favourites, and now, no longer a youthful or even a middle-aged beauty, had turned a Presbyterian.

Now, as the soldiers of the Parliamentary army were great readers of "such pamphlets as R. Overton's 'Martin Mar-Priest,' and more of his, and some of J. Lilburne's,"[1] they eagerly read and believed these Royalist and Presbyterian calumnies about Cromwell and Ireton put forth by John Lilburne, whose style had at least that quality of popularity which consists in making assertions with perfect confidence, and as if it were impossible there could be the

[1] Baxter's Autobiography, part i. p. 53.

least doubt about the matter asserted; for John Lilburne had one quality which has been attributed to a really great writer—he had never any doubt about anything. I will give an example of this presently. The consequence was, that a spirit of distrust spread rapidly through the army. But the mutiny said to have broken out appears to have assumed a serious aspect in only two regiments, Harrison's horse and Lilburne's foot.

Fairfax and his council of officers ordered a rendezvous of a division of the army between Hertford and Ware; and in his letter to the Speaker of the House of Lords, dated Hertford, November 15, 1647, says: "I rendezvoused this day three regiments of foot and four of horse, viz., of horse my own regiment, Colonel Rich's, Colonel Fleetwood's, and Colonel Twisleton's; and of foot, my own regiment, Colonel Pride's, and Colonel Hammond's. When they appeared all at the place of rendezvous, I tendered to them, and had read at the head of every regiment this enclosed paper [a petition to the General from many officers and soldiers], which was very acceptable to them, and to which they have given very full and ready concurrence, professing readiness to serve you and the kingdom. They profess likewise an absolute submission and conformity to the antient discipline of the army, by which I hope to order it to your satisfaction. There came thither also two regiments without orders, viz., Colonel Harrison's, of horse; and Colonel Lilburne's, of foot. These two had been very much abused and deluded by the agents who had their intercourses at London, and were so far prevailed withal that, when they came into the field, they brought with them in their hats a paper commonly called 'The Agreement of the People,' being very much inflamed towards mutiny and disobedience; but truly

I perceived the men were merely cozened and abused with fair pretences of those men which acted in the London councils; for Colonel Harrison's regiment was no sooner informed of their error, but, with a great deal of readiness and cheerfulness, they submitted to me, expressing the same affection and resolution of obedience with other regiments; and I believe you will have a very good account of them for time to come. As for Colonel Lilburne's, they were put into those extremities of discontent, that they had driven away almost all their officers; and came in marching up near to the rendezvous, contrary to the orders, the chiefest officer with them being a captain-lieutenant whom I have secured on purpose to try him at a council of war; and, for example sake, drew out divers of the mutineers, three whereof were presently tried and condemned to death; and, by lot, one of them was shot to death at the head of the regiment, and there are more in hold to be tried. I do find the same regiment likewise very sensible of their error, and testifying much seeming conformity to commands; so that I doubt not but I shall be able to give you a good account of that regiment also. And indeed I do see that the London agents have been the great authors of these irregularities, and wish some of better quality have not been their abettors."[1]

This letter is signed "T. Fairfax," a man whose credibility as a witness is at least equal to that of John Lilburne. Now in his "Legal Fundamental Liberties of England," p. 1, Lilburne says, "I positively accuse Mr. Oliver Cromwell for a wilful murderer for murdering Mr. Richard Arnold near Ware." To which the Attorney-General's answer was, "Which man, my Lord, was condemned for a mutineer by a council of war, when the

[1] Parl. Hist., iii. 791, 792.

Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland [Cromwell] was but one member, and the Parliament gave him and the rest of the council thanks for shooting that mutinous soldier to death." In answer to the Attorney-General, Lilburne talked of the Petition of Right, and cited the case of the Earl of Strafford, which is not a parallel case.[1] John Lilburne's own conscience might have whispered to him that he—Lilburne—was really the murderer of the poor man, whom his inflammatory nonsense had misled and ruined.

Charles had been desirous to wait the result of this rendezvous of the army, hoping that in the general confusion something might turn up advantageous to himself; but when he found his intrigues all detected, and additional guards put upon himself, he determined to effect his escape. Hobbes[2] and the other Royalist writers assert without evidence that Charles's escape from Hampton Court was caused by the machinations of Cromwell, who, they say, directed those that had him in custody to tell him that the adjutators meant to murder him. These writers make the mistake of confounding the different stages of a man's existence—of confounding the Cromwell of 1647 with the Cromwell of 1653. But this part of the subject is involved in such darkness that it is impossible to say that Cromwell at that time might not have been willing that Charles should escape from Hampton Court, most probably with the idea that he would go beyond sea. By the mismanagement of Charles and his agents this plan altogether failed, and instead of escaping beyond sea, Charles put himself into the hands of Colonel Robert Hammond, governor for the Parliament of the Isle of Wight, who kept him a close prisoner in Carisbrook Castle. Now, notwithstanding the letter published

[1] State Trials, iv., 1367, 1368. [2] Behemoth, p. 234.

by Lord Ashburnham from Cromwell to Colonel Robert Hammond, some passages of which may seem to convey a contrary view, his Lordship still thinks Hobbes's view of Cromwell's policy the most correct—namely, that he had much to hope and nothing to fear from letting the King escape whither he would, provided that it was beyond sea.[1] Baron Maseres takes a more favourable view of Cromwell's designs than the one stated above. After mentioning the resolution of the Commonwealth or Republican party to decline any further treating with the King for his restoration to the exercise of the royal authority, upon any terms whatever, thinking it safer and better, for the permanent peace and welfare of the nation, to settle the State without him, he adds: "And in this resolution Cromwell, since his late reconciliation with the Commonwealth party, seems to have concurred; but, till that event, I conceive him to have continued sincere in his professions of attachment to the King, and his desire of being the chief instrument of his restoration to the royal authority upon the moderate proposals drawn up by Commissary-General Ireton, or such others as might be thought sufficient to protect the liberties and privileges of the people against any future attempts of arbitrary power in the Crown."[2]

The business now began to assume a very dark aspect for Charles. He had sent Sir John Berkeley from the Isle of Wight with letters to Fairfax, Cromwell, and Ireton at Windsor. When Berkeley was half-way between Bagshot and Windsor, he was overtaken by Cornet Joyce, who had taken the King from Holdenby. "Upon my discourses

[1] Vindication of John Ashburnham (Ashburnham's Narrative), i. 316.

[2] Baron Maseres's preface to Select Tracts relating to the Civil Wars in England.

with him," says Berkeley, "I found that it had been discoursed among the adjutators, whether for their justification the King ought not to be brought to a trial; which he held in the affirmative: not, he said, that he would have one hair of his head to suffer, but that *they* might not bear the blame of the war."[1] Berkeley on reaching Windsor went to Fairfax's quarters, and found the officers met there in a general council. He delivered his letters to the General, from whom, however, he met with a very cold reception, as well as from Cromwell and Ireton and the rest of his acquaintance among the officers. The next morning having contrived to let Cromwell know that he had secret letters of instruction to him from the King; Cromwell sent him word that he durst not see him; bade him be assured that he would serve His Majesty as long as he could do it without his own ruin, but desired him not to expect that he should perish for the King's sake. Berkeley then proceeded to London, and opened a negotiation on behalf of the King with the Lords Lauderdale and Lanark. Application was at the same time made to the Queen for a ship of war to carry off Charles from the Isle of Wight.

In the meantime, while the Parliament was again deliberating about fresh propositions to be sent to the King, Charles addressed a letter to the Speaker of the House of Lords, to be communicated to the House of Commons, in which he repeated what he had said as to his scruples of conscience concerning the abolition of Episcopacy, but added that he hoped he should satisfy the Parliament with his reasons, if he might treat with them personally. The Commissioners of Scotland urged vehemently that this

[1] Sir John Berkeley's Memoirs, published in the same volume with Ashburnham's Narrative.

desire of the King for a personal treaty might be granted The Parliament adopted a middle course, and on the 14th of December they passed four propositions, drawn up in the form of bills, to which when the King had given his assent he was to be admitted to a personal treaty at London. These propositions were—1. That His Majesty should concur in a bill for the raising, settling, and maintaining forces by sea and land. 2. That all oaths, declarations, proclamations, and other proceedings against the Parliament, and those who had adhered to them, should be declared void. 3. That all the Peers who were made after the Great Seal was carried away should be rendered incapable of sitting in the House of Peers. 4. That power should be given to the two Houses of Parliament to adjourn as they should think fit.[1] The Commissioners of Scotland, who had received several communications from Charles himself, and had been influenced by Lauderdale, Lanark, and Berkeley, protested against the sending of these four bills to the King before he should be treated with at London. On the 24th of December the bills were presented at Carisbrook Castle to Charles, who absolutely refused his assent. He had now made up his mind to a secret treaty with the Scots, in which he engaged to renounce Episcopacy and accept the Covenant (with, it may be safely inferred, the same mental reservation as in his negotiations with Cromwell and Ireton); the Scots on their part engaging to restore him by force of arms. On the 28th of December he privately signed this treaty.

By this treaty, known by the name of the Engagement, Charles agreed to confirm the Covenant; to concur with the Presbyterians in extirpating the sectaries, and consequently the Independents and their army; and to give to

[1] Parl. Hist., iii. 823, 824.

Scotland the commercial advantages of England. These terms were meant to reconcile the Scots that an army might be raised; but there was no intention on the King's part to keep them. The understanding was that Ormonde should join them with all the forces he could raise, that Monro should return with the Scottish army from Ireland, and the Royalists be enlisted from all quarters.[1] While the two sets of Commissioners—namely, the Scots Commissioners, and the Commissioners from the English Parliament—were one day attending the King as he walked about the castle, they observed him to throw a bone before two spaniels that followed him, and to take great delight in seeing them contesting for it; "which some of them," says Ludlow, "thought to be intended by him to represent that bone of contention he had cast between the two parties."[2]

In regard to Charles's chance of escape by the assistance of those who might have been supposed to exert themselves most to that end, Lord Clarendon, speaking of the time of the King's imprisonment in Carisbrook Castle, says: "It was believed that His Majesty might have made his escape; which most men who wished him well thought in all respects ought to have been attempted; and before the treaty, he himself was inclined to it, thinking any liberty preferable to the restraint he had endured. But he did receive *some discouragement* from pursuing that purpose, which both diverted him from it, and *gave him trouble of mind.* It cannot be imagined how wonderfully *fearful some persons in France were that he should have made his escape, and the dread they had of his coming thither;* which without doubt was not from want of tenderness of

[1] Burnet's Memoirs of the Hamiltons, p. 324, *et seq.* Clar., v. 88, *et seq.*
[2] Ludlow's Memoirs, i. 232.

his safety, but from the apprehension they had, that the little respect they would have shown him there, would have been a greater mortification to him than all he could suffer from the closest imprisonment."[1]

On this passage Lord Ashburnham, who has examined the point very minutely, has made the following comment: "Of the many whose curiosity has been satiated by the reading of Lord Clarendon's History alone, it is probable that few have surmised, that by *some persons*, who were wonderfully fearful that the King should make his escape, and dreaded his coming to France, is meant *the Queen*."[2]

The reasons which acted on the Queen may be seen from the following note of Lord Ashburnham:[3] "He (Jermyn) first gained the title of Baron Jermyn; then of Earl of St. Albans: was made Knight of the Garter, and Lord Chamberlain to the King. The three last dignities were obtained from Charles II. What was his 'relation of service' either to the Queen-Consort or to the Queen-Mother, the noble historian [Clarendon], with his usual tenderness for royal frailties, and invariable fondness for mysterious enigmas, has so slightly insinuated, that were it not for other authorities, among whom may be enumerated Bishop Burnet, and Bishop Kennet, and Bishop Warburton, he would be wholly unintelligible. These are all unanimous in affirming that for some time previous to the King's death he (Jermyn) was Her Majesty's paramour; and subsequently (as Ariosto says of two more youthful lovers)—

'Per onestar la cosa'—

Her Majesty's husband."

[1] Clar. Hist., vi. 191.
[2] Lord Ashburnham's Vindication of John Ashburnham, i. 393, 394.
[3] Ibid., ii. 12, 13, note.

About the beginning of June 1648 several of the chief ships in the fleet of the Parliament revolted, put their vice-admiral, Rainsborough, ashore, affirming they were for the King and would serve Prince Charles, and sailed away to Holland, where the Prince and his brother the Duke of York then were. In the month of July the Prince of Wales appeared in the Downs with a fleet, consisting of the English ships which had deserted to him and some foreign ships which he had procured. But though he remained for some weeks master of the sea, he made no attempt for the liberation of his father from Carisbrook Castle. Though the failure of the Royalist insurrection which had broken out some time before rendered the presence of the fleet useless to the Royal cause for any other purpose, still (it has been said) if it had sailed to the Isle of Wight it might have saved the King. The unfortunate prisoner even expressly urged this course by a message. But in vain; he had to deal with those who, under a polished exterior, had hearts as hard, as selfish, and as inhuman as ever beat in a human form. Truly King Charles I. had as little cause as Prince Azo to "glory in a wife and son." But he was not placed in a situation to be able to express his sense of the obligations he lay under to those near relatives in the manner adopted by "the chief of Este's ancient sway."

On the 3d of January 164$\frac{7}{8}$ the Commons took into consideration the King's refusal of their four propositions. "The dispute," says May, "was sharp, vehement, and high about the state and government of the Commonwealth; and many plain speeches were made of the King's obstinate averseness and the people's too long patience." "It was there affirmed that the King by this denial had denied his protection to the people of England, for which only subjection

is due from them; that, one being taken away, the other falls to the ground; that it is very unjust and absurd that the Parliament, having so often tried the King's affections, should now betray to an implacable enemy both themselves and all those friends who, in a most just cause, had valiantly adventured their lives and fortunes; that nothing was now left for them to do, but to take care for the safety of themselves and their friends, and settle the Commonwealth (since otherwise it could not be) without the King."[1] Sir Thomas Wroth said "that Bedlam was appointed for madmen, and Tophet for kings: that our kings of late had carried themselves as if they were fit for no place but Bedlam: that his humble motion should consist of three parts: 1. To secure the King and keep him close in some inland castle with sure guards. 2. To draw up articles of impeachment against him. 3. To lay him by and settle the kingdom without him. He cared not what form of government they set up, so it were not by kings and devils. Ireton declared that the King had denied that protection to the people which was the condition of their obedience to him; that they ought not to desert the brave men who had fought for them beyond all possibility of retreat or forgiveness, and who would never forsake the Parliament, unless the Parliament first forsook them. Last of all, Cromwell told them, it was now expected that the Parliament should govern and defend the kingdom, and not any longer let the people expect their safety from a man whose heart God had hardened; nor let those that had so well defended the Parliament be left hereafter to the rage of an irreconcilable enemy, lest they seek their safety some other way. The report adds, that in saying this he laid his hand upon his sword and told

[1] May's Breviary.

them he trembled to think of what might follow."[1] Finally they passed a vote, in which the Lords concurred, that no further addresses or applications should be made to the King, or any message received from him, without the consent of both Houses, under the penalties of high treason.

A paper intituled "A Declaration from His Excellency Sir Thomas Fairfax and the General Council of the Army, of their resolution to adhere to the Parliament in their proceedings concerning the King," and dated "Windsor, January 9, 1647" (1648), was presented to the House of Commons by Sir Hardress Waller, with the following introduction (which shows that at that time the army had not put either force or disrespect on the House): "That the General had commanded seven colonels of them, with other officers of rank and quality, in the name of the whole army, to make their humble addresses, and represent their intentions in writing under the title of a declaration; with this reference that it should either have name or life or be exposed to view, according as it should receive approbation and direction from the House of Commons."[2] In the remonstrance demanding justice upon the King from the Lord-General Fairfax and the general council of officers held at St. Albans, November 16, 1648, they say with reference to the above vote of the House and declaration of the army, "Whatever evil men may slanderously suggest in relation to other matters, yet in this surely none can say you

[1] These speeches rest, however, only on the report of one Presbyterian writer, Clement Walker, author of the "History of Independency" and member for Wells, who though a member of the House of Commons at the time, is by no means an unquestionable authority, by reason of his violent prejudices. See Parl. Hist., iii. 832, 833. Hobbes, as might be expected, follows Walker, Behemoth, pp. 238, 239.

[2] Parl. Hist., iii. 835.

were acted [*sic*] beyond your own free judgment; we are sure not by any impulsion from the army; since nothing that ever past from us to you *before* did look with any aspect that way, but rather to the contrary."[1] The Declaration concluded with these words: "Understanding that the honourable House of Commons, by several votes upon the 3d inst., have resolved to make no further address or application to the King, nor receive any from him, nor to suffer either in others; we do freely and unanimously declare, for ourselves and the army, That we are resolved, through the grace of God, firmly to adhere to, join with, and stand by, the Parliament in the things voted on Monday last, concerning the King, and in what shall be further necessary for prosecution thereof; and for the settling and securing of the Parliament and kingdom without the King, and against him, or any other that shall hereafter partake with him."[2]

This declaration being read a second time, the Commons voted their approbation thereof; ordered their thanks to be returned to the General and the army for it; and that the same be forthwith printed and published.

A declaration was also presented to the House of Lords by the same officers that had presented the foregoing to the Commons, in which "the General and his Council of War, taking notice of some unworthy endeavours to asperse the integrity of their proceedings, as aiming at the overthrowing of peerage, and undermining of the rights and privileges of the House of Peers, do unanimously declare, That they hold themselves obliged, in justice and honour, to endeavour to preserve the peerage of this kingdom, with the just rights belonging to the

[1] Parl. Hist., iii. 1081. [2] Ibid. iii. 836.

House of Peers; and will really, in their places and calling, perform the same."[1]

If we might be permitted to hazard a conjecture as to this last declaration, we might suppose that as Fairfax had yielded to the opinions of others in several of the papers drawn up on the part of the army, in this paper expressing such attachment to the privileges of the peerage, the opinion of Fairfax had governed the opinions of some others.

[1] Parl. Hist., iii. 836, 837.

## CHAPTER XX.

*THE SECOND CIVIL WAR—THE TREATY OF NEWPORT.*

THE Scottish Commissioners having completed to their satisfaction their secret treaty with the King, now hastened down to Scotland to prepare for war. Since the beginning of the year 1644 the Scots had had a share in the executive power, which was vested in a committee styled the Committee of both Kingdoms. The original MS. Journal of the Resolutions and Proceedings of the Committee of both Kingdoms is still preserved in the State Paper Office, or Record Office, as it is now termed. The following is an extract from it: "Orders for the manner of proceeding.—1. A chairman to be chosen to continue a fortnight. 2. The Earl of Northumberland the first fortnight. 3. That the chairman be instructed to provide some minister of the Assembly to pray daily at the meeting and rising of the Committee." The Committee met first at Essex House; then, February 19, 164$\frac{3}{4}$, at Yorke House; February 20, at Warwick House; February 21, at Arundell House; February 22, at Worcester House; February 23, at Derby House; and there they continued to meet.[1]

In this "Committee of both Kingdoms" sat as representatives of England seven Peers—the Earls of Northumberland, Kent, Warwick, and Manchester; the Lords Say, Wharton, and Roberts—with thirteen members of the

[1] Journal of the Resolutions and Proceedings of the Committee of both Kingdoms, commencing February 164$\frac{3}{4}$. MS. State Paper Office.

House of Commons—Mr. Pierrepoint, Mr. Fiennes, Sir Henry Vane, senior, Sir Henry Vane, junior, Sir William Armyn, Sir Arthur Haselrig, Sir Gilbert Gerrard, Sir John Evelyn, Lieutenant-General Cromwell, Mr. St. John, Mr. Wallop, Mr. Crew, and Mr. Browne; and as representatives of Scotland, the Earl of Loudon, the Lord Maitland, the Lord Wariston, Sir Charles Erskine, Mr. Robert Barclay, and Mr. Kennedy. In the earlier days of the struggle between King Charles and the Parliament, the English and Scottish Parliaments had a common object, that of securing themselves against the King's attempts to make himself absolute. In this earlier period the Presbyterians were the dominant party in the English Parliament, and though they still were the majority in number, their power was by no means very firmly fixed, as the army was composed of Independents; and its ablest officers, as well as the ablest members of the Parliament, such as Vane and St. John and others, were to be reckoned on the side of the Independents. As the spirit of intolerance was very strong—vehement, even unto slaying—among the Presbyterians, it was to be expected that they and the Independents would soon come to open war. There is a remark, too, made by Carte, which may have some foundation of truth. He says: "The English Parliament" (the Independents he must mean, who could scarcely be held to represent the English Parliament at that time) "ever since they had got the King into their hands treated the Scots with great contempt. . . . The Scots hated the Independents mortally, and considered their power in England as the sure means of the ruin of their religion and (what they had more at heart) their fortunes. They thought there was no way to prevent these calamities but to keep up the divisions in

England; and for fear the Presbyterian party should be crushed by the other, they offered to send an army into England to their assistance."[1]

A contemporary writer, whose affections were with the Independents, gives a picture of the state of affairs at the beginning of the year 1648 so dark that it might almost seem as if Fairfax and Cromwell had undergone all their labours and perils, and their officers and soldiers had shed their blood, in vain. "The Parliament," says May, "though victorious, though guarded with a gallant army, no forces visibly appearing against it, was never in more danger. All men began in the spring to prophesy that the summer would be a hot one, in respect of wars, seeing how the countries were divided in factions, the Scots full of threats, the city of London as full of unquietness. And more sad things were feared, where least seen; rumours every day frightening the people of secret plots and treasonable meetings. . . . The King's party began to swell with great hopes, and look upon themselves not as vanquished, but as conquerors; nor could they forbear vaunting everywhere, and talking of the King's rising, and the ruin of the Parliament. The same thing seemed to be the wish of those whom they called Presbyterians, who were ready to sacrifice themselves and their cause to their hatred against the Independents, wished that quite undone which themselves could not do, and desired that liberty might be taken away by the King, rather than vindicated by the Independents."

Before I quote the remainder of this passage of May, I must call attention to the fact that the divinity of kingship was at that time really a part of the popular creed. The greatest names, too, in literature and philosophy—Shake-

[1] Carte's Ormonde, ii. 13, 14.

speare and Jonson, Bacon and Hobbes—lent their authority to the dogma that kings or queens (at least in England) were gods on earth; and from Edward the Confessor to Queen Anne they all claimed the power of working miracles. There is a tradition, which has been traced up to the actor Betterton, that Shakespeare received a present of money from King James for complimenting him on curing the *king's evil*, in the lines in Macbeth applied to Edward the Confessor. A royal proclamation, dated January 9, 1683, commences thus: "Whereas, by the grace of God, the kings and queens of this realm, by many ages past, have had the happiness by their sacred touch, and invocation of the name of God, to cure those who are afflicted with the disease called the *king's evil*. And His Majesty, in no less measure than any of his royal predecessors, having had good success therein, and in his disposition being as ready and willing," &c. It might have occurred to the popular mind as somewhat strange that "the grace of God," which in this royal proclamation is described as conferring on kings of England the power of curing the *king's evil*, did not confer the power of defeating the Parliamentary armies. The piece of gold which was given to those who were touched accounts for the miraculous cures, great numbers of poor people going to be touched for the piece of gold who never had a complaint that deserved to be considered as the evil.[1] Thus a confused association of ideas arose in their

[1] These were the words used by an old man to the Hon. Daines Barrington, who mentions the case in one of the curious and valuable notes to his "Observations on the more Ancient Statutes." As this note is particularly valuable as well as curious, I will quote part of it here; Barrington's opinion of Carte being worth attention, as well as his testimony on the king's evil. "In this early part of the English history" (6 Edw. I., 1278), he says, "I should always prefer the authority of Carte to that of any other historian: he was indefatigable himself in his researches, having dedicated his whole life to

minds between royalty and the power to work miracles, which is a sentiment distinct from the vulgar spirit of servility which May seems to mean in the following passage:—

"The King himself (though set aside, and confined within the Isle of Wight) was more formidable this summer than in any other, when he was followed by his strongest armies. The name of King had now a further operation, and the pity of the vulgar gave a greater majesty to his person. Prince Charles also, by his absence, and the name of banishment, was more an object of affection and regard to those vulgar people than he had ever been before; and, by his commissions (which his father privately sent him) seeming to be armed with lawful power, did easily command those that were willing to obey him; and, by commands under his name, was able to raise not only tumults, but wars."[1]

them, and was assisted, in what relates to Wales, by the labours of Mr. Lewis Morris of Penbryn in Cardiganshire: as for his political prejudices, they cannot be supposed to have had any bias in what relates to a transaction 500 years ago, and which hath nothing to do with the royal touch for the cure of the king's evil. I should here make an apology for introducing what hath no relation to the present statute (Statutum Gloucestriæ, 6 Edw. I., A.D. 1278); but I cannot help mentioning what I once heard from an old man, who was witness in a cause, with regard to this supposed miraculous power of healing. He had, by his evidence, fixed the time of a fact by Queen Anne's having been at Oxford, and touched him, whilst a child, for the evil: when he had finished his evidence, I had an opportunity of asking him whether he was really cured? Upon which he answered with a significant smile, that he believed himself to have never had a complaint that deserved to be considered as the evil; but that his parents were poor, *and had no objection to the bit of gold* [the italics are in the original]. It seems to me that this piece of gold, which was given to those who were touched, accounts for the great resort, and the supposed afterwards miraculous cures. Fabian Philips, in his treatise on Purveyance, asserts, p. 257, that the angels issued by the kings of England upon these occasions amounted to a charge of three thousand pounds *per annum*."—Barrington on the Statutes, p. 107, note [e], 4to. Fifth edition. London, 1796.

[1] May's Breviary.

Ludlow seems to have been of opinion that the insurrections that now broke out in various parts of the country were in part caused by the people's growing weary of the heavy load of taxation and other grievances to which the long civil war had subjected them. "Much time being spent," he says, "since the Parliament had voted no more addresses to be made to the King, nor any messages received from him, and yet nothing done towards bringing the King to a trial, or the settling of affairs without him; many of the people who had waited patiently hitherto, finding themselves as far from a settlement as ever, concluded that they should never have it, nor any ease from their burdens and taxes, without an accommodation with the King; and therefore entered into a combination to restore him to his authority."[1]

The first insurrectionary movement of any importance, which did not however rise above a tumult, broke out in London on Sunday the 9th of April, when a mob of apprentices stoned a captain of the trained bands in Moorfields, took away his colours, and marched in a disorderly manner to Westminster, shouting as they went, "King Charles! King Charles!" They were quickly scattered by a troop of horse that sallied out of the King's Mews; but returning to the city, they broke open houses to procure arms, and so alarmed the Lord-Mayor that he fled from his house and took refuge in the Tower. On the following morning Fairfax put down the tumult, but not without bloodshed. Shortly after, a body of about 300 men came out of Surrey to Westminster, demanding that the King should presently be restored. As they insulted the soldiers on guard, a collision ensued, in which several lives were lost. At the same time the men of

[1] Ludlow's Memoirs, i. 240.

Kent assembled in considerable numbers, and in Essex there was a great rising for the King. In the north of England also, in Wales, and in Scotland, there were risings of the Royalists and Presbyterians. The most formidable of these insurrections was that headed by Lord Goring, created Earl of Norwich, and that headed by the Hamiltons, who raised an army in Scotland and marched with it into England.

The men of Kent, after threatening the Parliament for some time at a distance, marched upon London. Fairfax encountered them in the end of May at Blackheath with seven regiments, and drove them back to Rochester. Lord Goring with several officers of the late army of the King made head again and got into Gravesend, while other bodies of the Kentish men took possession of Canterbury and tried to take Dover. But Ireton and Rich secured the latter; and Goring crossed the Thames and raised his standard in Essex. He was defeated and shut up in Colchester, whither Fairfax was despatched against him. Fairfax was at the time so ill of the gout as to require one of his feet to be bandaged; but this did not deter him from bearing all the fatigues of a campaign, and exposing himself in the hottest of the fight. Wherever he went he was victorious, and he now sent a trumpet to Colchester to summon Lord Goring, or the Earl of Norwich, and his associates to surrender; but Goring and his chief officers replied by a trumpet that they would cure him of the gout, and all his other diseases—an insult which enraged the soldiers as well as the General, and for which those who offered it paid dear.[1] Colchester, after an obstinate defence, surrendered on the 27th of August. Quarter was given to the privates and officers under the

[1] Rush., vii. 976, 1128, *et seq.* Whitelock, p. 308, *et seq.*

rank of captain; but the rest surrendered at the mercy of the General. Three of them—Sir Charles Lucas, Sir George Lisle, and Sir Bernard Gascoyne—were tried almost immediately by court-martial and condemned to be shot; but the sentence was only executed on the two first; Gascoyne being a foreigner, was pardoned. The Lord Goring and the Lord Capel were sent prisoners to London, and committed to the Tower by an order of the Parliament.[1] Lucas urged that the execution of the sentence on him was without precedent, "but a Parliament soldier standing by told him he had put to death with his own hand some of the Parliament soldiers in cold blood." Moreover, when he engaged in this insurrection he was a prisoner on parole; and Fairfax had told him in the beginning of the siege, when he proposed an exchange of prisoners, "that he had forfeited his parole, his honour, and faith, being his prisoner upon parole, and therefore not capable of command or trust in martial affairs." Whitelock says that the severity of the proceedings against these prisoners was in no small degree imputed to the message about curing the General of the gout, and all his other diseases.[2]

Several other insurrections were crushed without difficulty. The Earl of Holland, who had raised a force against the Parliament, was defeated by Colonel Scrope, and obliged to surrender on the condition of being safe

[1] Ludlow's Memoirs, i. 264.

[2] Whitelock, p. 312. The severity of the proceedings against Lucas and Lisle was, according to Clarendon, "generally imputed to Ireton, who swayed the General, and was upon all occasions of an unmerciful and bloody nature."—Clar., v. 176, *et seq.* The falsehood of this imputation is proved by the fact that Fairfax not only justified the proceeding in a letter to the Parliament, but in his own Memoirs. Old Parl. Hist., xvii. 430, *et seq.* Rush., vii. 1152, *et seq.* Whitelock, p. 312, *et seq.*

from military execution.[1] In Lancashire, Colonel Robert Lilburne, the brother of John Lilburne, with 600 horse, engaged 1000, headed by Sir Richard Tempest, and either took or destroyed them without the loss of a man.[2] Another party was defeated by Colonel Rossiter near Pontefract, and 1000 horse, nearly their whole body, with all their baggage taken.[3] Lambert was sent to meet Hamilton, as well as to suppress Langdale.

It is necessary here to notice one of the many intrigues of the Royalist and Presbyterian parties to get rid of Cromwell, whom they both dreaded as their most formidable enemy. One Major Huntington, of Cromwell's own regiment, whom of all the officers with whom he had come into communication Charles reposed most confidence in, because he accepted of his favours, laid down his commission, assigning as his reason that Cromwell had offered to the King to destroy the Parliament and join with any party to support him; and that he had then changed his policy for the same purpose of advantage to himself.

Major Huntington's charge of high treason against Lieutenant-General Cromwell is entered in the Lords' Journals, and a copy of it is printed in the "Parliamentary History."[4] The result of a careful perusal of Major Huntington's Narrative, on which he grounds his charge of high treason against Cromwell, is an impression that this charge of Huntington is pretty much of a mare's nest. What, it may be asked, does Huntington chiefly ground his charge upon? This seems his chief vantage-ground for his charge —that Cromwell "in his chamber at Kingston said what sway Stapylton and Holles had heretofore in the king-

[1] Rush., vii. 1187. Whitelock, p. 317. [2] Ibid.
[3] Rush., vii. 1182. Whitelock, p. 318. [4] Parl. Hist., iii. 965-974.

dom, and he knew nothing to the contrary but that he was as able to govern the kingdom as either of them." From these words Major Huntington by a strange logical process draws this inference, "So that in all his discourse nothing more appeareth than his seeking after the government of King, Parliament, city, and kingdom."[1] What Cromwell, according to Huntington's report, said only amounted to saying that he considered himself as able a man as Holles or Stapylton, which when we consider what Cromwell had done, and what Holles and Stapylton had done, appears a remarkably modest estimate by Cromwell of his own abilities—an estimate which probably no one then living would have dreamt of questioning, except perhaps Holles himself. Holles accordingly, whose envy and hatred of Cromwell were boundless, eagerly seized upon this new chance of ruining him. But though this charge was taken up and maintained most zealously by Holles and his party after their return to the Lower House, it was so vigorously opposed by the Independents, including some—Ludlow for one—who even then entertained no favourable opinion of Cromwell, that it was not admitted by the Commons, though the Lords had received it favourably.[2]

[1] Parl. Hist., iii. 973.

[2] Ibid., iii. 965. Ludlow says it was "manifest that the preferring this accusation at that time was principally designed to take him off from his command, and thereby to weaken the army, that their enemies might be the better enabled to prevail against them."—Ludlow's Memoirs, i. 254. Cromwell at a conference a short time before this "would not declare his judgment either for a monarchical, aristocratical, or democratical government; maintaining that any of them might be good in themselves or for us. The Commonwealth's men declared that monarchy was neither good in itself nor for us. That it was not desirable in itself, they urged from the 8th chapter and 8th verse of the First Book of Samuel, where the rejecting of the judges and the choice of a king was charged upon the Israelites by God himself as a rejection of him; with divers more texts of Scripture to the same effect. And that it

The Royalists and Presbyterians having thus failed in their intrigues against the man whose genius they equally dreaded, Cromwell proceeded in his work in South Wales, where a considerable army which had been raised to oppose the Parliament was defeated by Colonel Horton. Cromwell's first movements were directed against Poyer and Langhorn. Poyer had been in the service of the Parliament, and had been entrusted by them with the custody of Pembroke Castle, which he, being a man of intemperate habits, and it would seem a Royalist when under the influence of intoxication, now declared his resolution to hold for the King. It is stated—what I should think hardly credible if I had not heard a similar story, on good authority, of an officer quartered with his regiment in an unhealthy climate, who made his will every morning when sober and burnt it every night when drunk—that when sober in the morning he expressed the utmost penitence towards the Parliament; but when drunk in the evening was full of plots in favour of the opposite party.

was no way conducing to the interest of this nation was endeavoured to be proved by the infinite mischiefs and oppressions we had suffered under it and by it; that the king having broken his coronation oath which bound him to govern according to the law, and appealed to the sword, and thereby caused the effusion of a deluge of the people's blood, it seemed to be a duty incumbent upon the representatives of the people to call him to an account for the same, and then to proceed to the establishment of a Commonwealth founded upon the consent of the people. Notwithstanding what was said, Lieutenant-General Cromwell professed himself unresolved, and having learned what he could of the principles and inclinations of those present at the conference, took up a cushion and flung it at my head, and then ran down the stairs; but I overtook him with another which made him hasten down faster than he desired. The next day passing by me in the House, he told me he was convinced of the desirableness of what was proposed, but not of the feasibleness of it."—Ibid., i. 238–240. It appears from this that those whom Ludlow calls "the grandees of the House and army" had not determined to bring the King to trial; consequently the statement of Clarendon, that at a council held at Windsor a few days after the King's flight from the army it was determined to bring the King to trial, would appear to be unfounded.

Some of Langhorn's regiment had joined Poyer, and Langhorn shortly after his defeat by Horton followed himself. But they were speedily shut up in Pembroke Castle by Cromwell, who determined to reduce the place. Having accomplished this, he despatched some of his troops to join Lambert and prepared to follow himself,[1] to oppose the invasion of the Scots under Hamilton, of whose proceedings some account must now be given.

There were at this time three parties in Scotland—the rigid Presbyterians, the moderate Presbyterians, and the Royalists. The first, headed by Argyle, was made up of a few of the nobility—Eglinton, Cassilis, Lothian, and others—of the greater part of the clergy, and of the people of the middle and lower ranks, chiefly in the western counties. But though many persons of the middle and lower classes might be said to belong to this party, the influence of such persons on its counsels was extremely small. The aristocratical portion of the party, which though small in number far outweighed the rest in influence, was in favour of a republic, so far as a republic might transfer the power of the King to themselves, while they held fast to the appearance or shadow of monarchy as favourable to the preservation of their exclusive privileges. This party was determined not to restore monarchy except on certain conditions, which should limit the power of the King and extend their own.

The second party was chiefly composed of the nobility and gentry, and the representatives of the larger towns, and was headed by the Hamiltons, Lauderdale, Dunfermline, and others. This party, like the first-mentioned, professed to adhere to the Covenant; and perhaps the principal distinction between these two parties, the rigid

[1] Rush., vii. 2017, *et seq.*, 1110 *et seq.* Whitelock, p. 293, *et seq.*

and the moderate Presbyterians, may be stated to be, that the leaders of the moderate Presbyterians more manifestly made use of the Covenant as an instrument for their own worldly aggrandisement. If Lauderdale may in any degree be taken as a type or even as a specimen of this party, such a specimen certainly would not be calculated to produce a very favourable opinion of a moderate Presbyterian. A portrait of this man has been drawn by two writers, each of them perhaps the greatest master of his style of writing in modern times. Sir Walter Scott has placed him before us in the Edinburgh Chamber of Council and torture, "lolling out a tongue which was at all times too big for his mouth, and accommodating his coarse features to a sneer to which they seemed to be familiar," and giving the impression by his loud and coarse jocularity that he derived actual enjoyment from the sight of the agonies of those who had adhered to that Covenant which he had renounced for worldly gain. And Lord Macaulay has described him as being perhaps, under the outward show of boisterous frankness, the most dishonest man in the whole Cabal; of being accused of having been chiefly concerned in the sale of Charles I.; and, notwithstanding that, becoming the chief instrument employed by the son of Charles I. in the work of attempting to enslave the consciences of his former friends by cruelties hardly outdone by those of the Duke of Alva. And thus far he was a worse man than Alva, who had not apostatised from the religion of those he persecuted; even as Charles II. and James II. were worse men than Philip II., inasmuch as they repaid the Presbyterians for bringing them back upon Britain on that occasion which Algernon Sydney tersely describes as "making the best of our nation a prey to the worst," commonly called the Restoration, by treating them as Philip II.

treated the Hollanders and the Flemings, who had no claim to gratitude for restoring him to any kingdom he had lost, or pretended to have lost.

The third party were the Royalists, who avowed their purpose to be to restore Charles to despotism pure and unconditioned; and consisted of Montrose, Huntly, Lord Ogilvy, a few other noblemen and gentlemen, and some Highland chiefs.[1]

In the Scottish Parliament, which first met on the 11th of March $164\frac{7}{8}$, the Hamilton interest obtained a preponderance, and the Hamiltons and moderate Presbyterians were therefore able to attempt to carry out the Engagement they had entered into to restore the King by force of arms. But though some of them, such as Lauderdale and Loudon, were men gifted with an abundance of craft and cunning, the Engagers appear to have fallen into some great errors in their calculations. One of these errors was their regarding with contempt, as if it were an obstacle to be easily swept out of the way, the army of the Parliament, which had marched under Fairfax and Cromwell to so many victories. Thus as it had been agreed that neither country was to make war against the other without due warning, Hamilton and his party made three requisitions to the English Parliament—That the sectaries should be suppressed, the King recalled, and the army disbanded. To these requisitions they could hardly expect any answer but a negative; and fifteen days only were allowed for explanation, after which time the Scottish Parliament declared that they meant to restore the King according to the Covenant. They then adjourned. In their declaration to the English Parliament the great crime charged by

[1] Baillie's Letters and Journals, iii. 35, *et seq.* Edinburgh, 1842. Burnet's Memorials of the Hamiltons, p. 336. Thurloe's State Papers, i. 73, 74.

these moderate Presbyterians against the English Independents, or Sectaries, as they contemptuously styled them, is "toleration countenanced, and, by the new propositions, endeavoured to be settled;"[1] and these men, who when they had their King, whom they now pretend to be so fond of (being so fond of him, why did they not keep him when they had him?), sold him to the English Parliament, and having pocketed the price of him, now seek to get him back without repaying the money they got for him, so that they may have the value of him twice over,[2] thus express themselves: "Instead of security to religion according to the Covenant; instead of freeing His Majesty from his base imprisonment; instead of disbanding the army of sectaries by whose power and tyranny all these evils were come upon us, and further threaten us, the English Parliament has only sent them some very unsatisfactory propositions."[3] If they could but have got rid of that army of sectaries, they might have done more mischief, though some of them—Lauderdale, for instance—contrived to do a good deal before they ceased from troubling.

In the words quoted above from their declaration they also pretend to be as fond of "religion according to the Covenant" as of their King. They declared, when questioned as to the terms of the Engagement, that the King had given satisfaction; but they refused to disclose the terms, alleging that they had come under an oath of secrecy. But though this succeeded with a Parliament selected to carry out their purposes, the clergy and the bulk of the people at once perceived how treacherously

[1] Parl. Hist., iii. 946.

[2] They may have been of the way of thinking of the individual who being charged with selling his country, replied by thanking God that he had a country to sell.

[3] Parl. Hist., iii. 947.

they had acted. Argyle's party, the rigid Presbyterians, concluded that the terms could only be concealed because they were hostile to the Covenant, or were never intended to be observed. The clergy therefore, in their Assembly, opposed the Engagement; and the pulpits fulminated eternal damnation against its authors and abettors. On the other side, the Parliament passed sanguinary laws against those who should oppose their invasion of England, and provided for the impressment of men to serve as soldiers. So that on one side the people were threatened with terrible temporal punishment if they disobeyed the Parliament; on the other with all the terrors of Calvin's hell, if to escape the Parliamentary penalties they violated the Covenant. Some of the effects of this state of things are seen in such contemporary statements as that Hamilton pressed every fourth man in certain districts for his expedition into England;[1] and that many yeomen in Clydesdale, "upon fear to be levied by force," fled from their houses to Loudoun Hill.[2] Cromwell himself could hardly have been successful with an army levied in this manner. What chance of success Hamilton had then may be easily foreseen; particularly against troops raised, disciplined, and commanded as Cromwell's troops were. The moderate Presbyterians, when they indulged in insolence towards the English Independents, seemed to be ignorant of the fact which the whole history of the world had proved, that battles are won by the strongest battalions led by capable men, and that battles are great things, for liberty or empire lies beyond them; according to the use made of the results of victory. It is seldom indeed that liberty is the fruit; and assuredly if Hamilton

[1] Captain Hodgson's Memoirs, p. 124.

[2] Baillie's Letters and Journals, iii. 48. Edinburgh, 1842.

had on this occasion been successful, the bulk of the population of Scotland would have reaped no fruit from success, but would have remained as the English found them three years after when they came to fight the battle of Dunbar, "much enslaved to their lords."[1]

The vote which Hamilton had carried in the Scottish Parliament was for 30,000 foot and 6000 horse; but he could not raise more than 10,000 foot and 400 horse; and there had been so much delay in doing this that the English insurrection was almost quelled before the Scottish army of Hamilton was ready to take the field. Monro, who had been recalled from Ireland with 3000 men, followed Hamilton's army at a distance, that he might not be under the command of the Earl of Callender; and Hamilton himself did not form a junction with Langdale and the English Royalists, either through jealousy of him, or fear that his own men might be disgusted at the thought of being joined with Prelatists or Papists, or men that had fought against the Covenant. An army thus disjointed could derive little or no advantage from its numerical superiority, and might be expected to be routed, as it was, by such forces as Cromwell's, scarcely a third of its number.

The forces of the Parliament in the north of England being too weak to risk a battle, retreated before Langdale and Hamilton. They had not retreated far, however, when Cromwell, who had finished his work in Wales, and who knew well the value of time in war, came up, and joining Lambert and Robert Lilburne, surprised Langdale near Preston in Lancashire, drove him back upon the main body of the Scots, and then, on the same day, completely routed Hamilton, whom he pursued to Warrington.

[1] Whitelock, p. 468.

Lieutenant-General Baillie was taken prisoner, with a great part of the Scotch army, who had only quarter for their lives; and such of them as "appeared not to have been forced men" were by resolution of the English Parliament transported to the English plantations and Venice, whence the condition of the population of Scotland at that time may be seen, that they had the choice of being "much enslaved to their lords" in Scotland, or sold as slaves to the English plantations or Venice.[1] Hamilton himself was captured within a few days at Uttoxeter,[2] and not long after Langdale was taken at a little alehouse upon Colonel Hutchinson's land in Nottinghamshire, and sent to Nottingham Castle, from which he escaped some months after.[3] Monro, who had been left behind and kept his force together, hastened back to Scotland, news having arrived that Argyle with Leslie had raised an army of more than 6000 men in support of the Covenant.

Cromwell marched towards Scotland, and having crossed the Border, joined with Argyle in renewing the Covenant and getting the Engagement rescinded. And now a strange spectacle presented itself—that Cromwell, for vanquishing a Scottish army which had invaded England, should be

[1] "September 4, 1648.—The number of Scots prisoners taken at the defeat of the Duke of Hamilton, in Lancashire, being more than the country could possibly maintain, a committee of the House of Commons had been appointed to consider of some method to dispose of the common soldiers of that army; and it was proposed to engage with merchants for transporting abroad such of them as appeared not to have been forced men, which the House agreed to; and this day it was resolved, 'That the committee do take care, in the first place, to supply the English plantations, and then dispose of the rest to Venice; taking special security that none of them be transported to other places, or return to the prejudice of this kingdom; and that the contractors within fourteen days after such contract made do disburden the kingdom from any charge of maintaining those prisoners.'"—Parl. Hist., iii. 1004.

[2] Ludlow's Memoirs, i. 260. Second edition. London, 1721.

[3] Memoirs of Colonel Hutchinson, pp. 324, 325. Bohn's edition. London, 1854.

acknowledged in Scotland to have been the preserver of Scotland, and yet in England should not be allowed to have been the preserver of England! and that the same victory of his against the Scots should please the Presbyterian Scots for religion's sake, and yet, for religion's sake, should displease the Presbyterians of England! "Œdipus himself," observes May, "cannot unriddle this; especially if he judge according to reason, and not according to what envy, hatred, and embittered faction can produce."[1] And Ludlow says, "The pulpits who before had proclaimed this war now accompanied the army with their curses: for though they could have been contented that the sectarian party, as they called it, should be ruined, provided they could find strength enough to bring in the King themselves; yet they feared their old enemy more than their new one, because the latter would only restrain them from lording it over them and others, affording them equal liberty with themselves." This element of the character of the Independents as a religious body, or sect, as these Presbyterians opprobriously styled them, constituted the grand and honourable distinction between the Independents and the bigots and tyrants of their time. "Whereas," continues Ludlow, "the former was so far from that as hardly to suffer them to be hewers of wood and drawers of water;"[2] that is, those who styled themselves moderate Presbyterians were the feudal tyrants of the dark ages, merely using religion as a help to rivet upon the necks of their countrymen the fetters of feudal servitude. What cared they for religion? except so far as it consisted in what a gallant old soldier of Cromwell's who had the hard fate to survive the ruin of his cause, and to perish in a vain attempt to expel the Stuart tyrants and their abettors after

[1] May's Breviary. [2] Ludlow's Memoirs, i. 253.

they had been brought back, said, he would never believe that Providence had sent a few men into the world ready-booted and spurred to ride, and millions ready-saddled and bridled to be ridden. This was the creed of the moderate Presbyterians—as of all the Stuarts and all the Tudors and all their abettors, and was all the religion they really cared for. Well might the poor countrymen flee from their houses to the wilderness to avoid being levied by force. They had a sad foreboding what would be their fate if levied. They knew that those who undertook to lead them now, if some of them inherited the names or titles, did not inherit the military genius of those who three hundred years before had led their forefathers to victory. But now these moderate Presbyterians, in order to rivet once more on their countrymen the tyranny of the King and their own, dragged those poor men from their homes to be slaughtered in fight or condemned to slavery in the English plantations, or to be galley-slaves to the so-called republic of Venice. The English Parliament, if they may be thought to have dealt harshly with the poor soldiers, showed that they were no respecters of persons; for they struck off the head of the Duke of Hamilton, as well as that of his master King Charles, who had caused so much misery and shed so much blood.

It is rather surprising, in the resolution of the English Parliament of September 4, 1648, to find immediately following the words "the English plantations" the words "and then dispose of the rest to Venice." The Venetians were then engaged in the war of Candia with the Turks; and it may be inferred that for that reason they were in want of troops. At all events it must have been a hard fate for the poor Scotch Presbyterians to be dragged by Duke Hamilton, or any other duke, marquis, earl,

lord, or laird, from their country and homes to serve the Venetians, whether as galley-slaves or as common soldiers. I have in my "History of the Commonweath" touched on the subject of the treatment of prisoners of war.[1] It is difficult to ascertain what proportion of the Scots prisoners was shipped to the English plantations. It is certain they were not all so disposed of, either after the battle of Dunbar or after the battle of Worcester. There are in the MS. Order-Book of the Council of State of the Commonwealth minutes respecting the employment of some of the prisoners taken at Dunbar in the coal mines about Newcastle, and of others in agriculture in England. With regard to the prisoners taken at Worcester, the Council of State, on the 1st of October 1651, made an order, "That 1000 of the Scottish prisoners be delivered to the use of the undertakers for the draining of the Fens, upon condition that, if ten men of each hundred do escape from them, they do then forfeit, for every man escaping above the aforesaid number, the sum of £10."[2] And again, on the 9th of October, there is this order: "That so many of the Scottish prisoners, private soldiers, as are in Tothill Fields and also at York, and are sound and fit for labour, be delivered over for the draining of the Fens."[3] But the following minute of the 21st of October shows that some of the Scots prisoners were transported to the plantations: "That the Committee of prisoners do, upon usual security, give license for the transporting of some Scots prisoners to the Bermudas."[4] The following order, made on the 17th of December 1651, respecting the Scots prisoners taken at the battle of Worcester, furnishes evidence

[1] History of the Commonwealth of England, i. 378–384; ii. 203–214.

[2] Order-Book of the Council of State, October 1, 1651. MS. State Paper Office.

[3] Ibid., October 9, 1651.

[4] Ibid., October 21, 1651.

in favour of the humane treatment of their prisoners by the English Parliament and Council of State: "That it be referred to the Committee for prisoners to take into consideration the discharging of the Scots prisoners remaining now in Tothill Fields and about London, which were taken at the battle of Worcester; and also what allowance is fit to be made of clothing and money, for the enabling of them to return into their own country, the sum of which is to be paid by Mr. Frost out of the exigent moneys of the Council, and also what time is fit to be given for their performing of the journey."[1] Similar orders were made respecting the Scots prisoners at Shrewsbury,[2] and those at Durham and Gloucester.[3] And on the 30th of July 1652 the Council of State ordered "that the sum of £39, 3s., laid out for the clothing of some Scots prisoners before they went home, be paid out of the contingent moneys of the Council."[4] There is also an order that a warrant be issued to the Master and Wardens of the Company of Chirurgeons to appoint some skilful chirurgeons to dress constantly such of the Scots prisoners as were wounded at Worcester.[5] There are also orders on the same day for 112 bags of biscuits for the Scots prisoners at 16s. per cwt., and for payment of the "bakers and cheesemongers, which have furnished provisions to the Scots prisoners at £56, 5s. per diem and upwards."

The Scottish clergy now enjoyed their triumph at the defeat of Hamilton and his party, and the Engagers, high and low, were condemned to the stool of repentance. Loudon the Chancellor, whose wife had in her own right the estate of Loudon, and threatened to divorce him for

[1] Order-Book of the Council of State, December 17, 1651.
[2] Ibid., February 3, 165½.
[3] Ibid., July 1, 1652.
[4] Ibid., July 30, 1652.
[5] Ibid., September 16, 1651.

his manifold adulteries unless he submitted to the penance enjoined by the clergy, sat on the stool of repentance in his own parish church and received a rebuke in the face of the whole congregation. The scene as described was very characteristic of the time. The Chancellor with many tears deplored his temporary departure from the Covenant when he joined the party of the Engagement—that is, the party which engaged to restore the King by force of arms—and solicited in his behalf the prayers of the congregation, who at such a spectacle were dissolved in tears of joy. Mr. Brodie says that in a MS. of Wodrow's which he had seen it is stated that Archbishop Sharpe was at first for the Engagement; but finding that it was not a politic game, he brought to the stool of repentance all his parishioners who had in the least inclined that way.[1]

In the meantime the absence of many members of the Independent party from the House of Commons, by reason of their employment in the army against the enemy, so weakened their party in Parliament that their adversaries took advantage of it to attempt a recovery of their power.[2] The impeachments against the Peers and the members of the Commons were dropt; and the secluded members were restored to their seats in the House; those who had been committed on account of the force which was put upon the House by the late tumults being discharged from prison. The object of the Presbyterian party in the Parliament now was to conclude a hasty treaty with the King, in the hope that, with the name of Parliament joined to that of King, they might crush the Independents and their army. But the hope was

[1] Brodie's History of the British Empire, iv. 137, note. Whitelock says, "Letters from Scotland that they bring all to the stool of repentance that were in the last invasion of England."—Whitelock's Memorials, Feb. 5, $164\frac{8}{9}$.

[2] Ludlow's Memoirs, i. 251.

a vain one. Having a majority in the House of Commons, they rescinded the resolution against making more addresses to the King; and but for the decisive victories of Fairfax and Cromwell, they would have carried a proposition that, without binding him to anything, they should bring the King to London with honour, freedom, and safety, and then treat with him personally. As a sort of compromise between the two parties, it was voted that fifteen commissioners—the Earls of Northumberland, Pembroke, Salisbury, Middlesex, and Lord Say of the Upper House, and Thomas Lord Wenman, Sir Henry Vane, junior, Sir Harbottle Grimstone, Sir John Potts, Holles, Pierpoint, Browne, Crewe, Glynne, and Bulkley of the Commons—should conduct a treaty personally with Charles, not in London, but at Newport in the Isle of Wight.[1] "The King," says May, "during this treaty" (known as the Treaty of Newport, and entered upon on the 18th of September) "found not only great reverence and observance from the Commissioners of Parliament, but was attended with a prince-like retinue, and was allowed what servants he should choose to make up the splendour of a court. The Duke of Richmond, the Marquis of Hertford, the Earls of Southampton and Lindsey, with other gentlemen of note, and a competent number of them, waited in his train; his own chaplains and divers of his lawyers, to advise him in the treaty, were allowed there. But whilst this treaty proceeded, and some months were spent in debates, concessions, and denials, behold, another strange alteration happened, which threw the King from the height of honour into the lowest condition. So strangely did one contrary provoke another. Whilst some laboured to advance the King into his throne again upon slender

[1] Parl. Hist., iii. 1004.

conditions, or none at all, others, weighing what the King had done, what the Commonwealth, and, especially, what the Parliament's friends might suffer, if he should come to reign again with unchanged affections, desired to take him quite away. From hence divers and frequent petitions were presented to the Parliament, and some to the General Fairfax, that whosoever had offended against the Commonwealth, *no persons excepted*, might come to judgment."[1]

Some of the petitions presented to the General Fairfax during the month of October from various regiments for justice upon the King called the negotiations at Newport a trap. They were so;[2] but they did not succeed in entrapping the party of the Independents. It would be a mere waste of time and words to enter into the details of those negotiations. The object of the King was to spin out the time first, in the hope that the Scottish army, joined to the Royalists, would be successful: when that hope was destroyed by the defeat of the Scots, his prospects were not at an end, as he had formed the scheme of escaping to Ireland, and putting himself at the head of the Irish insurgents. His object therefore was not to conclude a treaty on such concessions as he affected an inclination to make, but to spin out the

[1] May's Breviary.

[2] On the 10th of October (1648) the King writes to Ormonde: "I must command you two things; first, to obey all my wife's commands, then, not to obey any public command of mine, until I send you word that I am free from restraint. Lastly, be not startled at my great concessions concerning Ireland, for they will come to nothing." And on the 28th of that month he again writes to the same effect: "Though you will hear that this treaty is near or at least most likely to be concluded, yet believe it not, but pursue the way you are in with all possible vigour. Deliver also that my command to all my friends, but not in a public way, because it may be inconvenient to me." —Append. to Carte's Ormonde, ii. 17. In one of his letters to Sir William Hopkins also, who resided opposite to Newport, and with whom Charles carried on a correspondence regarding a ship for his escape, he says, "To deal freely with you, the great concession I made to-day was merely in order to my escape."—Letters subjoined to Wagstaff's Vindication.

time, and so to overreach those with whom he treated; while he should be ready to seize the first favourable opportunity of making his escape. He also made such apparent concessions the more readily that he reserved a pretence of breaking off the treaty on the religious grounds; which pretence would favour the idea that he was deterred from accommodation by religious and conscientious motives, and not by a desire of power.

## CHAPTER XXI.

*REMONSTRANCE FROM THE ARMY FOR JUSTICE ON THE KING —PRIDE'S PURGE—CONDUCT OF VANE AND FAIRFAX ON THIS OCCASION.*

WE now enter upon the last stage of the career of the last King of England who attempted to enslave the people of England by open force. Others have since sought to attain the same end by other means; but this was the last who sought to attain that end, not merely by royal edicts and Parliamentary harangues and resolutions, but by blood and iron. But happily for the people of England, they found Englishmen who showed by their deeds that they could do something in this matter; and by their deeds proved that if their kings claimed, by right of conquest, a commission from God to oppress the people of England, God had given the people of England the same claim by the same right against their kings. And the men who had received this mark of divine favour were determined to make it as far as they could a warning to after-ages against what they termed "the blasphemous arrogance of tyrants," which instigated them "to do wrong and make war, even upon their own people, as their corrupt wills or lusts should prompt them."[1]

If there were any doubts about the matter before the second war against his people raised by King Charles, which war began and ended in the course of the spring,

[1] Remonstrance from the Army. Parl. Hist., iii. 4.

summer, and autumn of 1648, there were none now, and the fate of Charles Stuart, King of England, was sealed. In the course of the debate which ended in the vote against more addresses to the King, one member of the Commons had proposed setting the King aside and confining him for life in some inland fortress. But what had taken place since had convinced men who were as "quick to learn and wise to know," what was fittest to be done in cases the difficulty of which would have been insurmountable to men of inferior genius for government; as they were "stern to resolve and stubborn to endure;" that as regarded not only their repose, but their safety and their very existence, the only safe place of custody for King Charles was the grave.

On the 20th of November a remonstrance was presented to the House of Commons from Lord Fairfax and the General Council of the army, demanding justice upon the King, or in their own words, "That the capital and grand author of our troubles, the person of the King, by whose commissions, commands, or procurement, and in whose behalf, and for whose interest only, of will and power, all our wars and troubles have been, with all the miseries attending them, may be speedily brought to justice for the treason, blood, and mischief he is therein guilty of."[1] The entry of this business stands thus recorded in their journals: "The House being informed that some officers of the army, from the General, were at the door with a remonstrance, they were called in; and Colonel Ewer informed them, that the Lord-General, and General Council of the Officers of the Army, had commanded him, and those gentlemen with him, to present this remonstrance to that honourable House; and desired them to take it into

[1] Parl. Hist., iii. 1121.

speedy and serious consideration." The account given of this proceeding in the "Parliamentary History," which may have more or less of truth in it, is "that Cromwell in his triumphant march out of Scotland had endeavoured to engage the gentry in the north of England to oppose the going forward of the treaty with the King; and that several petitions to that end were presented to the Commons, of which the House took no notice; that Cromwell then formed a scheme for the several regiments to petition the Lord Fairfax, one after another, demanding justice upon the King; which was begun by Ireton, his son-in-law's, regiment, and then followed by Ingoldsby's, Fleetwood's, Whalley's, Barkstead's, Overton's, and others; that the consequence of this was the calling a General Council of Officers, and agreeing upon this Remonstrance, of which Ireton was the principal penman."[1]

This Remonstrance is exceedingly long, filling forty-nine columns of the new "Parliamentary History."[2] The sum and substance of the argument may be stated shortly thus: "The only security against the commission of crimes is the certainty of punishment overtaking the criminals. The only security of the governed against misgovernment is the power of punishing the governors. In all cases of like rebellions or civil wars, the prudence of most nations and ages, as well as the justice of the thing, has led to fix the exemplary punishment, first upon the capital leader, and others as nearest to him, and not to punish the inferiors and exempt the chief. In this case it is most clear that to fix your justice first upon the head, and thereby let his successors see what themselves may expect, if they attempt the like, may discourage them from heading any more what instruments they may find in the like quarrel;

[1] Parl. Hist., iii. 1077. [2] Ibid., iii. 1078-1127.

and so is like to be a real security when such instruments cannot find a head; but to punish only instruments, and let the head, by whose power, and in whose interest, all has been done, not only go free, but stand in perpetual privilege and impunity to head such instruments again, as oft as he can find opportunity, and get any to serve him, is a way so far from security, as that it leads indeed to endless trouble and hazard, or the total loss of all. Suppose the best constitutions and laws imaginable in any state, yet their insufficiency without a power to punish those that violate them — without the exemption of any person whatsoever from such punishment—is obvious. One example made of a king who had levied war against his people would be of more terror and avail than the execution of his whole party. On the other hand, the exemption of the King from punishment would proclaim the like perpetual exemption to him and his posterity, whatever they shall do; and would therein give the most authentic testimony to all these destructive Court maxims concerning the absolute impunity of kings, their accountableness to none on earth, and that they cannot do wrong; which principles, as they were begot by the blasphemous arrogance of tyrants upon servile parasites, and remain in our law-books as heirlooms only of the Conquest; so they serve for nothing but to establish that which begot them, tyranny; and to give kings the highest encouragement to do wrong and make war even upon their own people. If therefore our kings claim by right of conquest, God hath given you the same against them, and there is an end to their pretensions as if the whole people were made only for them, and to serve their lusts. We proceed in order to the dispensing of justice in relation to the late wars to propound as followeth: 1. That the capital and

grand author of our troubles, the person of the King, by whose commissions, commands, or procurement, and in whose behalf, and for whose interest only, all our wars and troubles have been, with all the miseries attending them, may be speedily brought to justice for the blood and mischief he is therein guilty of. 2. That a day may be set for the Prince of Wales and the Duke of York to come in and render themselves:—but, whether or not they render themselves, that the estate and revenue of the Crown may be sequestered, and all the matter of costly pomp or state suspended for a good number of years, while the desolations and spoils of the poor people made, by and in behalf of that family, and for that vain interest, the state and greatness thereof, may be in good measure repaired or recovered. 3. That, for further satisfaction to public justice, capital punishment may be speedily executed upon a competent number of his chief instruments also, both in the former and latter war. 4. That exemplary justice being done in capital punishment upon the principal author and some prime instruments of our late wars, the rest of the delinquents may, upon their submission and rendering themselves to justice, have mercy extended to them for their lives. 5. That the satisfaction of arrears to the soldiery, with other public debts, and the competent reparation of public damages, may be put into some orderly way; wherein care may be taken for some precedency of satisfaction to such whose loans or losses appear to have been great, and livelihoods small, so as they can worst bear the want or delay. After public justice we proceed to the settling of the kingdom—1, that there may be a reasonable and certain period set to the present Parliament; and 2, a certain succession of future Parliaments, with some provision for the certainty of their

meeting sitting and ending—for the equal distribution of elections to render the House of Commons as near as may be an equal representative of the whole people—and for full freedom in elections. That such representatives shall have the supreme power as to the making of laws, as to the making of war or peace; and as to the highest and final judgment in all civil[1] things without further appeal to any created standing power."

When the Remonstrance of the army was presented to the House of Commons on the 20th of November, the consideration of it was appointed for the 27th. But on that day it was again ordered to be put off to the 1st of December. These repeated delays gave great disgust to the army. The immediate consequence was "The Declaration of His Excellency the Lord-General Fairfax and his General Council of Officers, showing the grounds of the army's advance towards the city of London, November 29, 1648;" by way of appeal from the House of Commons to the people. In this declaration they say: "Being full of sad apprehensions concerning the danger and evil of the treaty with the King, and of any accommodation with him, or restitution of him thereupon, we did, by our late remonstrance, upon the reason and grounds therein expressed, make our application thereby unto the present House of Commons, that the dangerous evil of that way might be avoided, and the peace of the kingdom settled upon more righteous, safe, and hopeful grounds—viz., a more equal dispensing of justice and mercy, in relation to things done or suffered in the late wars, and the establishment of the future government of this kingdom upon a safe succession and equal constitution of Parliaments; and that for the ending of present, and avoiding of future

[1] "Civil" is here used in contradistinction to "religious."

differences, to be ratified by an agreement and subscription of the people thereunto. This course we took out of our tender care and earnest desire that all ways of extremity might be avoided, and that those matters of highest concernment to the public interest of the nation might be pursued and provided for if possible by those whose proper work and trust it was. . . . But to our grief we find, instead of any satisfaction or reasonable answer thereto, they are wholly rejected without any consideration of them." After stating, among other things, that the conduct of the majority of that House of Commons can be attributed to "nothing less than a treacherous or corrupt neglect of, or apostasy from, the public trust reposed in them," they thus conclude: "For all these ends we are now drawing up with the army to London, there to follow Providence as God shall clear our way.—By the appointment of His Excellency the Lord-General and Council of Officers. J. RUSHWORTH."[1]

On November 30, the day following the date of this declaration, Fairfax wrote a letter to the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and Common Council of the city of London. The letter is dated "Windsor, November 30, 1648," and runs thus: "My Lord and Gentlemen,—Being upon an immediate advance with the army towards London, we thought good hereby to give you notice thereof. For the ground and necessity leading us hereunto, we refer you to our late remonstrance, and to our later declaration, concerning the same. We have only this further to add, that as we are far from the least thoughts of plunder, or other wrong, to your city, or any other places adjoining, which we hope your former experience of us will give you cause enough to credit us in; so, for the better prevention

[1] Parl. Hist., iii. 1137–1141.

of any disorder in the soldiery, or of any abuse or inconvenience to the inhabitants in quartering of the soldiery at private houses, we earnestly desire that you would take a present course for the supply of money to pay those forces while we shall be necessitated to stay there, upon which, we assure you, we shall so dispose of them into great and void houses about the city, as much as may be possible, as that few or none of the inhabitants shall be troubled with quartering of any soldiers at all; and for this purpose we desire that £40,000 may be forthwith provided upon the security of our arrears, to be ready to be paid out to the forces to-morrow night, if possible; and we shall be ready to receive from you any intimation for the further prevention of hurt or inconvenience to the city in this business.—I remain yours, &c., FAIRFAX."[1]

The city authorities having communicated with the Parliament in respect to this letter, in consequence of the answers they received from both Houses, ordered a committee from the common council to wait upon the Lord-General with a letter promising payment of the sum demanded, or the most part of it, the next day; and desiring that in the meantime no violence or injury might be done to the citizens. The House of Commons also ordered a letter to be written to the General on this occasion, which is not entered in the journals. The purport of it appears from the contemporary writers to have been to forbid the army's nearer approach towards London. But while the committee were preparing this letter, the House was informed that the army were advanced within a mile of Westminster; that they had planted guards at Hyde Park Corner, cut down trees, levelled the enclosure, and laid it in common. Hereupon a motion was

[1] Parl. Hist., iii. 1144.

made for adding a clause to the letter, "That the army's approach was derogatory to the freedom of Parliament;' but it passed in the negative by forty-four against thirty-three.[1]

On the 2d of December the Lord-General Fairfax took up his lodgings at Whitehall, attended by six regiments of horse and four of foot, which were quartered at St. James's, the Mews, York House, and other great vacant houses in the skirts of the city, and in the adjacent villages. On December 4 the Commons received intelligence of the King's having been removed from Newport to Hurst Castle by an order from the Council of War.[2] When Charles was removed from the Isle of Wight to Hurst Castle, situated on a low bank of sand and shingle which projects from the coast of Hampshire over against the Isle of Wight, dark suspicions of secret assassination again arose in his mind. But the leaders of the Independents and the Independents themselves were men who abhorred the course of assassination, pursued to such an extent by their Royalist enemies; they were men who had courage equal to the bold and open course which they deemed essential, and which was essential, to the success of their cause. The lesson which it was their special object to convey to after-ages could not have been of any avail, much less of the great avail it has been of, if what they did had been done in a corner; as if it were a deed they were ashamed or afraid to do in the full light of day, and in the face of heaven and earth.

On the 4th of December the Commons by 136 against 102 voted that the removal of the King to Hurst Castle was without their knowledge or consent; and then renewed the debates upon the commissioners' report of the treaty.

[1] Parl. Hist., iii. 1145. [2] Ibid., iii. 1147.

In this debate, which continued all night and till nine next morning, Prynne made a speech of enormous[1] length. Prynne asserts in the appendix to his speech of December 4 that many members were converted to his opinion by his speech; and "the majority of the House declared both by their cheerful countenances and their words (the Speaker going into the withdrawing-room to refresh himself so soon as the foregoing speech was ended) that they were abundantly satisfied by what had been thus spoken."[2] The result, whether or not in any degree due, as Prynne affirms, to his eloquence, was a vote by 140 against 104 "that the answers of the King to the propositions of both Houses are a ground for the House to proceed upon for the settlement of the peace of the kingdom." They also nominated a committee to confer with the General for keeping a good correspondence between the Parliament and the army. On December 5 the Lords passed a vote to the same effect, and then adjourned to the 12th.[3] This at once brought matters to a crisis; and the leaders of the party of the Independents on the following day, December 6, put in execution what they had for some time deemed to be necessary, if they and their country were not to give up all they had fought for.

The measure of turning out the Presbyterians by force was so far from being, as some have affirmed, a part of a scheme of a military despotism, that it would seem to have been mainly devised by two of the most determined and most honest republicans of the whole body of the Independents, Ludlow and Ireton. It also appears, according

[1] Prynne's speech on this occasion fills eighty-seven of the closely-printed columns of the "Parliamentary History."

[2] Parl. Hist., iii. 1239.

[3] Ibid., iii. 1240.

to Ludlow and Mrs. Hutchinson, that Ireton, some months before, was averse to violent proceedings by the army against the Parliament, when Ludlow and others thought them expedient.[1] In their narratives of these proceedings Mrs. Hutchinson and Ludlow, though the former does not mention Ludlow, and the latter does not mention Colonel Hutchinson, show that there was a great difference of opinion between Colonel Hutchinson and Ludlow respecting the interference of the army.[2] Ludlow says: "The

[1] Mrs. Hutchinson mentions Cromwell as also of that opinion, but Ludlow, whose account, as will be shown presently, seems more to be relied on, makes no mention of Cromwell on this occasion.

[2] In this difference of opinion respecting the interference of the army, the editor of Mrs. Hutchinson's Memoirs of Colonel Hutchinson says, "we may see the source of the dissension which more openly took place afterwards between Colonel Hutchinson and Ludlow, and caused the latter to calumniate Colonel Hutchinson as he did."—P. 332, note. Bohn's edition. But Ludlow was not the only one who expressed an opinion of Colonel Hutchinson's conduct at the Restoration, which is here termed "calumny;" for Algernon Sydney, in a letter to his father the Earl of Leicester, dated Hamburgh, August 30, 1660, first published from Mr. Lambard's collection by Mr. Blencowe, says: "If I could write and talk like Colonel Hutchinson or Sir Gilbert Pickering, I believe I might be quiet; contempt might procure my safety; but I had rather be a vagabond all my life, than buy my being in my own country at so dear a rate; and if I could have bowed myself according to my interest, perhaps I was not so stupid as not to know the ways of settling my affairs at home, or making a good provision for staying abroad, as well as others. . . . It will be thought a strange extravagance for one, that esteemed it no dishonour to make himself equal unto a great many mean people, and below some of them, to make war upon the King; and is ashamed to submit unto the King, now he is encompassed with all the nobles of the land, and in the height of his glory, so that none are so happy as those that can first cast themselves at his feet. I have enough to answer all this in my own mind; I cannot help it if I judge amiss; I did not make myself, nor can I correct the defects of my own creation. I walk in the light God hath given me; if it be dim or uncertain, I must bear the penalty of my errors. I hope to do it with patience, and that no burden shall be very grievous to me, except sin and shame. God keep me from those evils, and in all things else, dispose of me according to His pleasure. I have troubled your Lordship very long, but it is that I might ease you of cares that would be more tedious, and as unfruitful."—Blencowe's Sydney Papers, pp. 196–198. London: John Murray, Albemarle Street, 1825.

treaty with the King being pressed with more heat than ever, and a design visibly appearing to render all our victories useless thereby; by the advice of some friends I went down to the army, which lay at that time before Colchester; where attending upon the General Sir Thomas Fairfax, to acquaint him with the state of affairs at London, I told him that a design was driving on to betray the cause in which so much of the people's blood had been shed; that the King being under a restraint would not account himself obliged by anything he should promise under such circumstances; assuring him that most of those who pushed on the treaty with the greatest vehemency, intended not that he should be bound to the performance of it, but designed principally to use his authority and favour in order to destroy the army; who, as they had assumed the power, ought to make the best use of it, and to prevent the ruin of themselves and the nation. He acknowledged what I said to be true, and declared himself resolved to use the power he had, to maintain the cause of the public, upon a clear and evident call, looking upon himself to be obliged to pursue the work which he was about. Perceiving by such a general answer that he was irresolute, I went to Commissary-General Ireton, who had a great influence upon him, and having found him, we discoursed together upon the same subject, wherein we both agreed that it was necessary for the army to interpose in this matter, but differed about the time; he being of opinion, that it was to permit the King and the Parliament to make an agreement, and to wait till they made a full discovery of their intentions, whereby the people becoming sensible of their own danger, would willingly join to oppose them. My opinion was that it would be much

easier for the army to keep them from a conjunction, than to oppose them when united."[1]

It will be observed that Ludlow makes no mention whatever of Cromwell, who was indeed not at the siege of Colchester but employed in South Wales before he went northward against Hamilton's forces. But Mrs. Hutchinson, while she as usual makes Colonel Hutchinson the principal figure upon the stage, also introduces Cromwell as if he were present—which is strange, and quite irreconcilable with Ludlow's statement. She says: "When Colonel Hutchinson came, going first to Commissary Ireton's quarters, he found him and some of the more sober officers of the army in great discontent, for the Lieutenant-General [Cromwell] had given order for a sudden advance of the army to London, upon the intelligence they had had of the violent proceedings of the other party, whereupon Cromwell was then in the mind to have come and broken them up, but Colonel Hutchinson, with others, at that time persuaded him that, notwithstanding the prevalency of the Presbyterian faction, there were yet many who had upright and honest hearts to the public interest, who had not deserved to be so used by them, and who could not join with them in any such irregular ways, though in all just and equitable things they would be their protectors. Whereupon at that time he was stayed."[2]

The only point in which this statement agrees with Ludlow's is, that at the time of the siege of Colchester Ireton was against the interference of the army, because he did not think the time for such interference had arrived. On the other hand, Colonel Hutchinson was against interference altogether, because, like Whitelock, he was against

[1] Ludlow's Memoirs, i. 262–264.

[2] Memoirs of Colonel Hutchinson, p. 332. Bohn's edition. London, 1854.

"any such irregular ways." Precisely the same argument applies to the war from the very first against Charles I. If that war was to be justified, the turning out the Presbyterians, who were bent on rendering all that had been done in that war nugatory, was to be justified; and to talk about "just and equitable things" at such a time as Mrs. Hutchinson here does, is like preaching a sermon to a man who is picking your pocket, instead of knocking him down. I am puzzled to account for this passage of Mrs. Hutchinson's Memoir, which in general bears all the internal evidence of being written with accurate knowledge. The only explanation that occurs to me here is that her memory may have deceived her, writing at a time distant from the events she relates, and may have only retained accurately the facts of Ireton's having been against the interference of the army at that particular point of time.

It appears from Ludlow's narrative that on the 5th of December some of the principal officers of the army held a consultation with some members of Parliament and others; and it was concluded after a full and free debate that the measures taken by the Parliament were contrary to the trust reposed in them: that it was therefore the duty of the army to endeavour to put a stop to such proceedings; having engaged in the war, not simply as mercenaries, but out of judgment and conscience, being convinced that the cause in which they were engaged was just, and that the good of the people was involved in it. This resolution having been come to, three of the members of the House and three of the officers of the army—though Ludlow does not name these six, Ludlow himself was evidently one, and it may be inferred that Ireton was another; Cromwell did not reach London from Scotland

till the evening of the following day—withdrew into a private room to consider of the best means to attain the ends of their resolution. It was there agreed that the army should be drawn up the next morning, and guards placed at Westminster Hall, the Court of Requests, and the Lobby; that none might be permitted to pass into the House but such as had, according to the opinion of the Independents, "continued faithful to the public interest." "To this end," says Ludlow, "we went over the names of all the members one by one, giving the truest character we could of their inclinations, wherein I presume we were not mistaken in many; for the Parliament was fallen into such factions and divisions, that any one who usually attended and observed the business of the House, could, after a debate upon any question, easily number the votes that would be on each side, before the question was put. Commissary-General Ireton went to Sir Thomas Fairfax,[1] and acquainted him with the necessity of this extraordinary way of proceeding, having taken care to have the army drawn up the next morning by seven of the clock. Colonel Pride commanded the guard that attended at the Parliament doors, having a list of those members that were to be excluded, preventing them from entering the House, and securing some of the most suspected under a guard provided for that end; in which he was assisted by the Lord Grey of Groby and others, who knew the members."[2]

On the following day what had been thus resolved upon was carried out in all points. On the "night after the interruption of the House" Cromwell arrived at

[1] He had then become Lord Fairfax by the death of his father the preceding summer.

[2] Ludlow's Memoirs, i. 269-271. Second edition. London, 1721.

Whitehall from Scotland, and "declared that he had not been acquainted with this design; yet since it was done, he was glad of it, and would endeavour to maintain it."[1]

No great party has ever suffered more from misrepresentation than the Independents. Lord Macaulay even, who is more inclined to do them justice than many other writers, says in reference to Horace Walpole's hanging up in his villa an engraving of the death-warrant of Charles, with the inscription "*Major Charta:*" "Yet the most superficial knowledge of history might have taught him that the Restoration, and the crimes and follies of the twenty-eight years which followed the Restoration, were the effects of the greater Charter. Nor was there much in the means by which that instrument was obtained that could gratify a judicious lover of liberty. A man must hate kings very bitterly, before he can think it desirable that the representatives of the people should be turned out of doors by dragoons in order to get at a king's head."[2] The paper in which these words occur appeared in the "Edinburgh Review" in October 1833. By October 1838 —that is, five years after—a little more light had broken in upon Lord Macaulay on this subject. Of Charles II. he then says, "The restored Prince, admonished by the fate of his father, never ventured to attack his Parliaments with open and arbitrary violence."[3] And the brother and successor of Charles II., who went a step or two further than Charles II. in the matter of open and arbitrary violence, also admonished by the fate of his father, fled from England and ended his days in exile.

Now this was something; and if, as may be probably concluded, it was the effect of the great execution, the

[1] Ludlow's Memoirs, i. 272, 273. Second edition. London, 1721.
[2] Essay on Horace Walpole. [3] Essay on Sir William Temple.

great execution had precisely answered the purpose which Ireton fully and clearly expressed in the army's Remonstrance for justice upon the King—the purpose, namely, of breaking once and for ever the spell of inviolability and consequent impunity for any crimes whatsoever that had "by the blasphemous arrogance of tyrants" been woven round kings.

In the first extract I have given from Lord Macaulay he has stated the question without, however, solving it, as his manner of stating might have led him to think he had done. For there is a way of stating a question which does not really state the facts of the question, but the view taken of those facts by the person making the statement. But between 1833 and 1838 his opinion would seem to have undergone some change. Lord Macaulay in that first extract makes two assumptions—that the Restoration was the consequence of the King's execution, and that the representatives of the people were turned out of doors by the army. I have seen it somewhere stated, though I cannot at this moment recover the place, that the more respectable portion of the Parliament was turned out of doors.

Now let it be supposed that the Presbyterian party succeeded in their object of breaking the army and bringing back the King, as they phrased it, "with freedom, honour, and safety," what would have been the probable consequences? Lord Macaulay has expressed them thus: "Under any circumstances we should have preferred Cromwell to Charles. But there could have been no comparison between Cromwell and Charles victorious, Charles restored, Charles enabled to feed fat all the hungry grudges of his smiling rancour and his cringing pride. The next visit of His Majesty to his faithful

Commons would have been more serious than that with which he last honoured them; more serious than that which their own General paid them some years after. The King would scarce have been content with praying that the Lord would deliver him from Vane, or with pulling Marten by the cloak. If by fatal mismanagement nothing was left to England but a choice of tyrants, the last tyrant whom she should have chosen was Charles."[1]

This alternative there was no way of avoiding but by turning out the Presbyterians who were bent on bringing it about. Then as to cutting off the King's head; that undoubtedly was a measure which, though it produced most salutary effects as regarded after-ages, was attended with disadvantageous consequences to the political party that carried it out. It gave one of the falsest and cruellest men that ever lived an opportunity of appearing on a public stage in circumstances peculiarly calculated to draw towards him popular sympathy. So that the Gunpowder Plot and the Execution of Charles I. threw a sort of delusive halo, or rather haze, of light around two of the worst of a line of bad kings. But if this was an error on the part of the Independents, it was an error which was unavoidable. The army were determined on this point, and those who led the army were obliged to follow here.

And how have the Presbyterian and Royalist writers treated the Independents, who did the work the Presbyterians could not do; who defeated and utterly broke in pieces the King's armies—as the Remonstrance of the army says—four armies altogether? They have all, from Denzil Holles to David Hume, treated the Independents in their writings as if they were the lowest and vilest of mankind. Denzil Holles, the son of one of James I.'s

[1] Essay on Hallam's Constitutional History.

peers, which is a brand of disgrace far more than a mark of honour, thus writes: "A mercenary army raised by the Parliament, all of them, from the General (except what he may have in expectation after his father's death) to the meanest sentinel, not able to make a thousand pounds a year lands, most of the colonels and officers mean tradesmen, brewers, tailors, goldsmiths, shoemakers, and the like; a notable dunghill, if one would rake into it, to find out their several pedigrees: these to rebel against their masters," &c.[1] And David Hume, who informs us in his Life, written by himself, that his father's family was a branch of the Earl of Home's or Hume's, thereby connecting himself with the peerage as well as Holles, thus describes the high court of justice for the trial of the King: "Cromwell, Ireton, Harrison, and the chief officers of the army, most of them of mean birth, were members, together with some of the Lower House and some citizens of London."[2] It would be merely a sign of an upheaving of the lower strata of society if Holles and Hume's statements were correct; and undoubtedly some men rose to eminence and influence from humble stations. But all the men who rose to the highest power and leadership were men of education, and of what is styled good birth. Cromwell, Ireton, Blake, Vane, and Scot had all received a university education. And some of the most determined republicans—such as Adrian Scrope, Henry Nevill, William Say, Miles Corbet, John Lisle, Lord Grey of Groby, and others—were men belonging to the families of the old Plantagenet nobility—a nobility who were warriors and not court-lackeys, like the Tudor and Stuart

[1] Memoirs of Denzil Lord Holles, from 1641 to 1648, p. 149. London, 1699.

[2] Hume's History of England, chap. lix.

nobility, and would not have submitted to the murder of any of their number, as the Scotch nobility did to the murder of the Earl of Gowrie and his brother under the most infamous and disgraceful circumstances by James VI. The Royalists, on the other hand, were mostly new men, who had been raised to the peerage or baronetage by the Tudors and Stuarts. It is a well-observed and familiar fact that men who have had ancestors of such a kind that they had not derived their descent literally through scoundrels from the Flood, would be less likely to fawn and cringe on the Tudors or Stuarts than those who having no illustrious ancestry seek distinction from connection with a king—whatever he be.

There were two men who acted a conspicuous part on the side of the Independents, and yet refused to co-operate with them in the trial and execution of the King. These two men were Vane and Fairfax—men of very dissimilar character, but like in one thing, that both were, though men of free, not servile condition, in a state of slavery—the former being the slave of fear, the latter the slave of his wife.

Both Clarendon and Burnet affirm that Vane went to the treaty of Newport on purpose to delay matters till the army could be brought up to London; on the ground that if the King did not grant quickly as much as would content the Parliament, the army would proceed their own way—that is, they would depose the King and settle a republic.[1] If such was Vane's purpose, he succeeded in accomplishing it. But such a scheme does not appear very consistent with his professions of not consenting to the King's execution. For Vane was too much in the counsels of Cromwell and was too clear-sighted a man not

[1] Clar. Hist., v. 203. Burnet's Hist. of his Own Times, i. 44.

to see well that the two transactions bore to each other the relation of antecedent and almost inevitable consequent. If Vane disapproved of the execution, he could not as a man of strict honour ever again act with the men who brought it about. This was certainly a grave error of conduct, to say the least, in Vane. But it may perhaps be considered as having been redeemed by the truth and constancy of the last period of his life, and by a death which may be almost called heroic.

But what shall be said of Fairfax, who lent the great weight of his name to all the proceedings which were hurrying Charles to the block, and only withdrew it at the very last, as if he whose courage as a soldier had been proved on so many fields of battle wanted courage now to look his own deeds in the face, or rather to face the ultimate consequences of them? Some writers[1] have surmised that as he was now by the death of his father, which had taken place the preceding summer, though not an English, a Scotch peer, and as there had been a prospect of an earldom being conferred on him for his services by the Parliament, the design of abolishing the House of Lords was distasteful to him. Clarendon indeed undertakes to explain Fairfax's inconsistent conduct by the influence of Lady Fairfax, who "was," he says, "of a very noble extraction, one of the daughters and heirs of Horace Lord Vere of Tilbury, who having been bred in Holland had not that reverence for the Church of England she ought to have had, and so had unhappily concurred in her husband's entering into rebellion, never imagining what misery it would bring upon the kingdom, and now abhorred the work in hand as much as anybody could do; and did all she could to hinder her husband

[1] Brodie, iv. 189.

from acting any part in it."[1] Clarendon has here touched on one of the most powerful principles of resistance to the government sought to be established by the Independents. A writer of that time, the clearness and compactness of whose style forms a strong contrast to the obscurity and diffuseness of Hyde's, has given the explanation of this in one short sentence: "Ostentation of ancestors is a sign of pusillanimity, because all men are more inclined to make show of their own power when they have it, than of another's."[2] Now, so few have anything of their own to make show off, that they are glad to fall back upon ancestors, real or imaginary; for very few indeed ever had any real ancestors worth mentioning, much less worth boasting of. Even in the long line of these De Veres, Earls of Oxford—Lady Fairfax's father was descended from a brother of the sixteenth Earl of Oxford—almost the only line running on without interruption through male heirs, there is but one man, Robert de Vere, third Earl of Oxford, one of the twenty-five barons appointed to enforce the observance of Magna Charta, who could be brought forward as having done anything worth talking about or even mentioning, though poets have ranted about "Oxford's famed De Vere," as they call it, without reason, for it had never done anything but produce male heirs. And what had this Robert de Vere done compared to the great actions of Fairfax, the husband of this high-born Presbyterian daughter of the De Veres? She probably did not at all relish the idea of a new aristocracy made out of the victorious army[3] of the Parliament superseding the aristoc-

[1] Clar. Hist., book xi. p. 196.

[2] Hobbes's Human Nature, p. 61. Third edition. London, 1684.

[3] When Baxter, after the battle of Naseby, paid a visit to the army of the Parliament, he found that Cromwell's chief favourites among the officers held some opinions which, he says, greatly shocked him. "What," they said,

racy, then old if not effete, that had been made some six hundred years before, out of the victorious army of William, the bastard son of Robert le Diable, Duke of Normandy. Nevertheless the arguments in the Remonstrance of the army for justice on the King are strong and solid; if not irrefragable; and Fairfax himself indorsed them, since he wrote the letter to the Speaker which accompanied and enforced the Remonstrance. The letter is dated St. Albans, November 16, 1648, and is signed "Fairfax," his father Lord Fairfax having died the preceding summer. There is indeed a passage in his Memoirs in which he says, "They set my name in way of course, to all the papers, whether I consented or not." Is this passage an interpolation? It would seem so; for Fairfax, though his Presbyterian wife—he was not a Presbyterian himself—seems to have exerted an evil and most pernicious influence on him, had the candour to say, at the Restoration, when the restored man was beginning his butcheries, "that if any person must be excepted, he knew no man that deserved it more than himself, who being general of the army at that time, and having power sufficient to prevent the proceedings against the King, had not thought fit to make use of it to that end."[1]

Mrs. Hutchinson gives her testimony as to the sincerity of Cromwell in urging Fairfax not to lay down his commission when the army was about to enter on the cam-

"were the lords of England but William the Conqueror's colonels? or the barons but his majors? or the knights but his captains?"—Baxter's Autobiography, p. 51. Folio. London, 1696.

[1] Ludlow's Memoirs, iii. 10. "The Earl of Northumberland was heard to say, that though he had no part in the death of the King, he was against questioning those who had been concerned in that affair; that the example might become useful to posterity, and profitable to future kings by deterring them from the like exorbitancies."—Ibid.

paign in Scotland which led to the battle of Dunbar. "To speak the truth of Cromwell," she says, "whereas many said he undermined Fairfax, it was false; for in Colonel Hutchinson's presence, he most urgently importuned him to keep his commission, lest it should discourage the army and the people at that juncture of time, but could by no means prevail, although he laboured for it almost all the night with most earnest endeavours. But this great man was then as immovable by his friends as pertinacious in obeying his wife; whereby he then died to all his former glory, and became the monument of his own name, which every day wore out."[1] The consequences of the influence of Fairfax's wife were far more momentous than if they had only concerned Fairfax himself, for they involved as immediate consequences twenty-eight years of oppression and disgrace, and the revival of all the evils Fairfax had fought so well to put down—"the liberty," to borrow the words of Algernon Sydney, "which we hoped to establish, oppressed; luxury and lewdness set up in its height, instead of the piety, virtue, sobriety, and modesty, which we hoped God by our hands would have introduced; *the best of our nation made a prey to the worst;* the Parliament, Court, and army corrupted, the people enslaved."[2] If Fairfax had remained true to his first principles, and Ireton had lived, Cromwell would never have outraged the Parliament, and would never have been Protector.

[1] Memoirs of Colonel Hutchinson, pp. 344, 345.

[2] Blencowe's Sydney Papers, p. 200. London: John Murray, Albemarle Street. 1825.

OF THE
BOMBAY
BRANCH
OF THE

## CHAPTER XXII.

*THE KING'S TRIAL AND EXECUTION.*

ON the 23d of December 1648 there was a debate in the House of Commons on that part of the Remonstrance from the army which related to bringing delinquents to justice. The result was a resolution to bring the King to trial; and a committee of thirty-eight was nominated to examine witnesses and prepare a charge against him. The Commons, after having been several days employed in fixing upon the manner of proceeding against the King, on the 2d of January sent up a message to the Lords with a vote which had passed their House without a division, declaring "that by the fundamental laws of this kingdom, it is treason in the King of England, for the time being, to levy war against the Parliament and kingdom of England;" and at the same time they sent up to the Lords an ordinance for erecting a high court of justice for the trying and judging Charles Stuart, King of England; to both which they desired their Lordships' concurrence.[1]

Upon this occasion a great debate arose in the House of Lords upon the question, "Whether it be treason by the fundamental laws of England for the King of England to levy war against the Parliament of England?" The Earl of Manchester showed "that, by the fundamental laws of England, the Parliament consists of three estates, of which

[1] Parl. Hist., iii. 1252-1254.

the King is the first: that he, only, hath power to call and dissolve them, and to confirm all their acts, and that without him there can be no Parliament; and therefore it was absurd to say, the King can be a traitor against the Parliament." The Earl of Manchester was seconded by the Earl of Northumberland, who said "that the greatest part, even twenty to one, of the people of England, were not yet satisfied whether the King did levy war against the Houses first, or the Houses first against him. And besides, if the King did levy war first, they had no law extant, or that could be produced, to make it treason in him so to do." And the question being put, whether the said ordinance should be cast out? it was resolved in the affirmative, *nem. con.;* and then the Lords adjourned for a week.[1]

The statement of the Earl of Northumberland, that there was no law extant, or that could be produced, to make it treason in the King to levy war first against the Parliament, was so far a correct statement of the law of the case; since all the laws of high treason in England down to that time had been made to protect the King and not the subject; and to what extent those laws had been carried under the Tudors and the two first Stuarts, and how their cruelty and oppression had been increased and assisted by torture, though torture was declared by all English lawyers to be contrary to the law of England, has been fully shown in the first chapter of this history. It was therefore not to be expected that the English law of treason should contain any power to punish an aggressor who had striven, as Strafford and his master King Charles unquestionably had done, to make the English King absolute and Englishmen slaves.

[1] Parl. Hist., iii. 1255, 1256.

But the Commons were determined to adhere to their notion of a high court of justice, as if the crimes which under the name of treason they imputed to the King had been distinctly defined and marked out by the fundamental laws of England. Having appointed a committee to inspect the Lords' Journals, and discovering that there were votes recorded against their ordinances, they, following out an intimation which they had sent up before the civil wars by Denzil Holles himself, determined to act without the Lords. Accordingly on the 4th of January $164\frac{8}{9}$ they passed the following resolutions: "That the people are under God the original of all just power; that the Commons of England, in Parliament assembled, being chosen by, and representing the people, have the supreme power in this nation; that whatsoever is enacted, or declared for law, by the Commons in Parliament assembled, hath the force of a law, and all the people of this nation are concluded thereby, although the consent and concurrence of King, or House of Peers, be not had thereunto."[1] On the 6th of January the Commons passed an Act for the trial of the King by a high court of justice specially constituted. The Commons thenceforth styled themselves the Parliament. On the 9th of January a new Great Seal was ordered, on which was to be engraven on one side a map of England and Ireland, with the words, "The Great Seal of England, 1648;" on the other side a sculpture of the House of Commons sitting, with the words, "In the first year of freedom by God's blessing restored, 1648." Whitelock says that the device and more particularly the inscriptions on the seal were the fancy of Henry Marten. The sum of £60 was ordered to be charged on the revenue towards

[1] Parl. Hist., iii. 1257.

the expense of this seal, which was afterwards increased to £200.[1]

There were in all about a hundred and fifty commissioners nominated by the Parliament for the trial of the King; of whom any twenty were empowered to act as a high court of justice.[2] But there do not appear to have acted more than eighty-one of those nominated; and never more than seventy-one at one time. Lord Fairfax sat once as a commissioner and assented to what was done. But after that he sat no more, and consequently has been reckoned among the chief of those who would take no part in the proceedings, though he did not scruple to continue in his office of General, and acknowledge the new Parliament. He had, however, the candour to acknowledge at the Restoration, as has been noticed in the preceding chapter, that if any man ought to suffer for the death of Charles, it should be himself, since he might have prevented it had he thought fit.[3] I have before touched on the subject of the mischievous effects of Fairfax's conduct; and I will add here some remarks of the editor of Colonel Hutchinson's Memoirs which appear to me to place the matter in a true light. The note is with reference to the passage where Mrs. Hutchinson says that Fairfax—when the English army was just about to march into Scotland before the battle of Dunbar—"persuaded by his wife and her chaplains, threw up his commission at such a time when it could not have been done more spitefully and ruinously to the whole Parliament interest."[4] On this the editor, the Rev. Julius Hutchinson, says: "For it was only with the co-operation of a man, who to

[1] Parl. Hist., iii. 1257, 1258. Rush., vii. 1396, *et seq.* Whitelock, pp. 365, 366.
[2] Ibid., iii. 1254, 1255.
[3] Ludlow's Memoirs, iii. 10. Second edition. London, 1720.
[4] Memoirs of Colonel Hutchinson, p. 344. Bohn's edition. London, 1854.

his military talents added that moderation and integrity, which will distinguish Fairfax to the end of time, that the great politicians of those days could have planned and have finished such schemes of representation, legislation, and administration as would have rendered the nation great and happy, either as a commonwealth or mixed government. They had in some respects such opportunities as never can again arise; and if the Presbyterians have nothing else to answer for, the perverting the judgment of this excellent man was a fault never to be forgiven; if the ruin of their own cause could expiate it, they were not long before they made atonement."[1]

The Royalists, among the innumerable falsehoods which they propagated against their opponents, said that those who acted as commissioners in the high court of justice were almost entirely men of mean extraction. But it is only necessary to examine the list to be satisfied that the reverse was the fact. In all the cases which had before occurred in the English annals where a king had been dethroned, he had perished by secret assassination. This is the only occasion on which those who had dethroned the King for his alleged misgovernment and breach of trust had the manliness and courage to regard with contempt or abhorrence the course of assassination, and to do what they believed to be a great act of justice with all the publicity and solemnity which befitted such an act. Yet these men have been assailed with a scurrility which those who had assassinated such kings as Edward II. and Richard II. have escaped; and while Charles I. is a martyr, we hear nothing of the martyrdom of Edward II. or Richard II. The cause is no doubt to be looked for in the great accession of power which the kings had obtained

[1] Memoirs of Colonel Hutchinson, p. 345, note.

all through Europe between the time of Richard II. and that of Charles I., and which had invested kingship with a species of sanctity partaking of the nature of divinity. This was also the first time in modern history that a king had been deposed and killed by any but princes and great nobles; and the worshippers of kings thought it a strange height of arrogance and presumption that a body of men which, though it might include the names of a few peers, was known to consist substantially of those whom not many years before the very doorkeepers of the House of Lords ventured to treat with insolence,[1] should venture to do such an act, and to do it too so openly and fearlessly.

The commissioners for the trial of the King appointed John Bradshaw, serjeant-at-law, their president—"a stout man," says Whitelock, "and learned in his profession: no friend to monarchy."[2] At the same time Steel was appointed attorney to the court, Cook solicitor, and Dorislaus, a native of Holland, and Aske were appointed their assistants. Steel being prevented from attending the court by real or pretended sickness, his duty devolved upon

[1] One day in March 160⅔, Sir Herbert Croft, and some other members of the House of Commons, offering to enter the House of Lords, one of the doorkeepers repulsed them, and shut the door in their faces with these words, "Goodman burgess, you come not here."—Com. Jour. Lunæ, Martii 19, 160⅔.

[2] Bradshaw has been said to have been of a Cheshire family. But at Chapel-in-the-Frith in Derbyshire is pointed out Bradshaw Hall—now a farm-house—as formerly belonging to "Bradshaw the Regicide," whose name and coat-of-arms, with the date 1620, are still plainly visible on an arched gateway at the back of the house. There is an oak staircase in the house with quaint Puritanical mottoes at the top of the landing-place. Noble and Chalmers state that the place of his education is not recorded; but his will establishes this, for he makes bequests to certain schools which he names, and at which he says he received his education. His will was proved December 16, 1659. By a codicil dated September 10, 1655, he gives £10 to John Milton. See Ormerod's Cheshire, iii. 409. Only a few days before his death, when at one of the meetings of the Council of State Colonel Sydenham

Cook. The calumnies fabricated by the Royalists against Cook, it having been asserted that he was illiterate and not even a member of the bar, may be refuted by a single short extract from a work of his on the subject of a very important legal reform made when Ireton was Lord-Deputy of Ireland, and he, John Cook, Chief Justice of Munster. "My Lord-Deputy," says Cook, "hath altered the provincial courts into county courts; and whereas the people travelled forty or fifty miles, now their differences are ended at home. . . . It is a mixed court, and the bill may contain both law and equity, whereby half the suits in the province are ended or prevented. The cause is ended as soon as it is ripe for hearing. . . . Precipitancy indeed is the step-mother of justice, and must be carefully avoided as falling from a rock; but that is to hear and to determine before both parties are ready, or have had time to be so. Otherwise when the cause is ripe why should not the court put in the sickle? A speedy trial is the plaintiff's joy, and just judgment delayed may prove worse than an unrighteous sentence speedily pronounced."[1] Upon the Restoration these courts ceased to sit. They were re-

endeavoured to justify the proceedings of the army by saying they were necessitated to use such violence "by a particular call of the divine Providence," "the Lord President Bradshaw," says Ludlow, "who was then present, though by long sickness very weak and much extenuated, yet animated by his ardent zeal and constant affection to the common cause, upon hearing those words, stood up and interrupted him, declaring his abhorrence of that detestable action, and telling the Council, that being now going to his God, he had not patience to sit there to hear His great name so openly blasphemed; and thereupon departed to his lodgings, and withdrew himself from public employment."—Ludlow's Memoirs, ii. 726, 727. He survived this but a few days, dying November 22, 1659, happily before the commencement of the Restoration butcheries. He was buried with great pomp in Westminster Abbey, whence his body was dragged at the Restoration, to be exposed upon a gibbet, with those of Cromwell and Ireton.

[1] Monarchy no Creature of God's Making. By John Cook, Chief Justice of Munster. Waterford, 1652.

established in the reigns of William and Anne,[1] and have proved very useful.

On the 20th of January $164\frac{8}{9}$ the commissioners appointed by the Parliament to form a high court of justice for the trial of the King proceeded from the Painted Chamber, where they had assembled, to Westminster Hall to open the court. The place appointed for the trial was the site of the old Courts of King's Bench and Chancery, at the upper or south end of Westminster Hall, the partition between them being taken down. A rail, extending from the court down the length of the hall to the western side of the great door, separated the soldiers from the spectators; the former being stationed in great force, armed with partisans or halberts, within the rail on its western side, by the old Courts of Common Pleas and Exchequer Chamber; while the latter thronging in at the great door formed a dense crowd in the large space left open on the eastern or Thames side of the rail. Strong guards were stationed upon the leads, and at the windows looking on the hall. All the narrow avenues to the hall were either stopped up with masonry or strongly guarded. When all the commissioners present, in number sixty-seven, had answered to their names, the court commanded the serjeant-at-arms to send for the prisoner, who had been brought up from Windsor to St. James's on the preceding day. In a quarter of an hour Colonel Tomlinson, who had the King in charge, conducted him into court. The serjeant-at-arms, with his mace, received the King in the hall, and conducted him to the bar, where a crimson-velvet chair was placed for him facing the court. The King looked sternly upon the court and the audience, and sat down without moving his

[1] By Irish Acts, 9 W. III. c. 15 (A.D. 1697); 2 Anne, c. 18 (A.D. 1703); 6 Anne, c. 5, &c.

hat. The judges kept on their hats also. Presently the King rose up and turned about, looking down the vast hall, first on the guards which were ranged on its left or western side, and then on the multitude of spectators which filled the space on the right.

The King being again seated, Bradshaw, as president, having commanded silence to be proclaimed, addressed him and said, "Charles Stuart, King of England, the Commons of England assembled in Parliament being deeply sensible of the calamities that have been brought upon the nation, whereof you are accused as the principal author, have resolved to make inquisition for blood; and, according to that debt and duty they owe to justice, to God, the kingdom, and themselves, they have resolved to bring you to trial and judgment, and for that purpose have constituted this high court of justice before which you are brought." Then Cook, as solicitor for the people of England, stood up to read the charge, when the King, gently touching him on the shoulder with his staff, commanded him to forbear. While he was in the act of touching Cook's shoulder, the head of his staff fell off, and one of his attendants having stooped to lift it up, it rolled to the opposite side, and the King was obliged to stoop for it himself.[1] It has been said that this trivial incident first opened the King's eyes to the critical position in which he stood; for that even when he first entered Westminster Hall that day he was firmly persuaded that the court durst not proceed to judgment.

The President, notwithstanding the King's command, ordered the counsel to proceed. Cook then, in accordance with the order of the commissioners delivered to the counsel before the trial, exhibited on behalf of the

[1] Herbert, p. 115. Warwick, pp. 339, 340.

people of England a charge of high treason and other crimes, which may be summed up in these words of the charge: "The said John Cook did impeach the said Charles Stuart as a tyrant, traitor, murderer, and a public and implacable enemy to the commonwealth of England." Cook then delivered in the charge in writing to the court, and Bradshaw ordered the clerk to read it. This charge seems to have been framed so as to bear some resemblance to the judicial procedure in England. But as in England all such indictments had been for the offence of treason in "levying war" against the King, it is evident that the attempt to give this trial the form of the judicial procedure established in England must have been futile.

I have often wondered that men of so much practical ability as Cromwell and Ireton should not have seen what advantages they gave the King, and under what disadvantages they placed themselves and their party, by the course which they adopted of bringing the King to judgment. I have gone along with them hitherto from the time when Cromwell, as he said himself, "in a way of foolish simplicity," showed the Parliament how he could create an army which under him and his officers was invincible, to the Remonstrance of that army for justice upon the King. But when they determined to bring the King to trial by a high court of justice specially constituted for that purpose, they do not appear to have estimated correctly the difficulties of that mode of proceeding. It seems to me impossible to read the proceedings on the King's trial without feeling that the Independents in that matter had put themselves in the wrong. For instance, the King says: "Let me know by what lawful authority I am seated here, and I shall not be unwilling to answer. In the meantime I have a trust committed to me by God,

by old and lawful descent. I will not betray it to answer to a new unlawful authority: therefore resolve me that, and you shall hear more of me." And Bradshaw, the President of their high court of justice, replies: "If you had been pleased to have observed what was hinted to you by the court, at your first coming hither, you would have known by what authority; which authority requires you, in the name of the people of England, of which you are elected King, to answer." The King's answer to this is nearer the truth than the President's assertion, which is surely a false position to be held by a high court of justice. "England," the King said, "was never an elective kingdom, but an hereditary kingdom for near these thousand years."

Bradshaw afterwards cites Bracton to the effect that the King has a master—God and the law.[1] He might have cited Fleta to the same effect.[2] He might also have cited Bracton to prove that the English monarchy was elective; for Bracton says, "For this has he been made *and elected*, that he may do justice to all."[3] But it is useless to talk of a kingdom being elective which not only descended by a certain line of devolution, but which Henry VIII. considered so much his private property as to dispose of it by will, and which his daughter Elizabeth on her deathbed made over to James VI. of Scotland. Bradshaw did not seem to be aware of the great change that had taken place in the kingly power in England between the time of Henry III. and the time of the sitting of the court to try Charles I. The change that had taken place during the four hundred years that had elapsed between the time of Bracton and the time of Bacon—that is, between the reign of

[1] Bracton de Legibus, lib. II. c. 16, § 3; and lib. I. c. 8, § 5.
[2] Fleta, lib. I. c. 5, § 4.
[3] Bracton, lib. III. c. 9, § 3.

Henry III. and the reign of James I.—is strikingly shown in the difference between the words of Bracton and those of Bacon; Bracton's words being, "Rex habet superiorem, Deum et legem;" and Bacon's being, "A king is a mortal god on earth." In fact, if Bracton and Fleta had lived and written, as they wrote, in the times of the Tudors and the Stuarts, they would have had a good chance of sharing the fate of Peacham—of being questioned respecting their treasonable books "before torture, in torture, between torture, and after torture." In truth, the power of the warlike nobility which kept the kings in check at the time when Bracton and Fleta wrote, had by the time Bacon wrote completely disappeared, and no other power had risen in its place until the year 1644, when Cromwell's cuirassiers scattered in flight the Royalist cavalry, before always victorious. It was therefore to be expected that a Tudor or Stuart king should be somewhat slow to take the view of his kingly office taken by Bracton, and when he found himself a prisoner on his trial by his subjects—at least a part of them, to give occasion to Bradshaw to say—"You look upon us as *a sort of people met together; and we know what language we receive from your party;*" but swords are sharper than words, as the courtiers found. It was also to be expected that he should give occasion to his judge, whose legal education made him acquainted with the old English lawyers, to say, as Bradshaw said: "Truly, sir, you have held yourself, and let fall such language, as if you had been no way subject to the law, or that the law had not been your superior. Sir, the court is very sensible of it, and I hope so are all the understanding people of England, that the law is your superior; that you ought to have ruled according to the law. Sir, I know very well your pretence that you have done so; but, sir, the difference hath been

who shall be the expositors of this law." Bradshaw then goes on as if the law were sure of being expounded in courts of justice in the sense he, Bradshaw, would expound it, and not as in the passages cited in the first chapter of this history from the trials of the Duke of Norfolk and Sir Walter Raleigh, in such a manner as to deprive the prisoner of any chance of a fair trial when he had the Crown for his adversary.

All this sufficiently shows that the kings of England had, at least from the time of Edward IV., been exercising a tyranny, particularly in regard to torture and the conduct of State trials, which was not sanctioned by the laws of England; yet the advantage the King derived from the false assumptions of the court, such as that England was an elective kingdom, enabled him to make his case appear much better than it really was; even though he said much that was manifestly untrue, as when he said, "For the charge, I value it not a rush; it is the liberty of the people of England that I stand for." This is certainly a bold assertion for a man to make who had done everything in his power to destroy all liberty in England—except the liberty of the King; that is, the power or freedom of the King to do what he willed, as expressed in the title of King James's work, "The True Law of *Free* Monarchies." A free monarchy means a pure despotism —an absolute monarchy—a monarchy free and absolved from any law but the will of the monarch.

This mode of proceeding also gave occasion to incidents calculated to move compassion. The entreaty of the King to be heard in the Painted Chamber, supposed to relate to a proposal for abdicating in favour of his eldest son, which was urged with great earnestness, so moved one member of the court, John Downes, that he desired the court might

adjourn to hear his reason against the sentence being pronounced without hearing what the King wished to say. The members of the court accordingly adjourned, and after some debate resolved to proceed without granting the King's request. On this occasion Cromwell, according to Downes's own account, said, "Sure the gentleman did not know that they had to do with the hardest-hearted man upon earth; and that it was not fit the court should be hindered from their duty by one peevish man."

Cromwell was right in calling King Charles "the hardest-hearted man upon earth;" so that in him, as in his lieutenant Montrose, the errors of the head had no chance of being corrected by the instincts of the heart, often a safeguard against the errors of the head. I have often had occasion to note instances of selfish disregard of the sufferings of others in this king. I will here add a remarkable instance, given by Mr. Jardine from manuscripts in the State Paper Office. In April 1627, Lord Falkland, then Lord-Deputy of Ireland, wrote to Secretary Conway, stating that he had arrested two priests, whom he suspected of traitorous designs; that in order to draw the full truth from them, he was desirous of putting them to the rack; but as his doing so to priests would cause great scandal, he wished for some warrant from the Council. The Secretary in his answer, dated the 30th May 1627, commends the Lord-Deputy's diligence, and says, that "as to the racking of the priests, he has mentioned his scruples to the King, who is of opinion that he may rack them, or kill them, if he thinks proper."[1]

In regard to the witnesses examined against the King, whose evidence was directed to the single point of those military operations which were personally directed and

[1] Jardine's Criminal Trials, i. 19. London, 1847.

carried on by the King against the Parliamentary forces, some of the Royalist writers say, "Various witnesses were then examined privately in the Painted Chamber against the King;" and they print the words "privately in the Painted Chamber" in italics, in order that their readers may infer that this private examination of witnesses was a violation of law and a breach of the established practice; the fact being that at that time in State trials witnesses against a prisoner were never brought face to face with that prisoner.

I have shown in the first chapter of this history, from the most authentic records, what was the government of the Tudor and Stuart kings and queens. I have shown that they had taken upon them, by a pretended right which they called prerogative, to subject the people of England to torture, which was strictly prohibited by the laws of England —which laws had not been repealed by a new conquest. I have also shown that those tyrants had deprived the people of England of all chance of a fair trial wherever the Crown was concerned, and in place of the old laws of England had introduced an elaborate system of cruelty and oppression very similar to that of the Roman emperors when the Roman imperial tyranny was at its height.

What, then, are we to think of the assertion of King Charles, made in answer to some of Bradshaw's observations, many of which were in truth somewhat by the mark, that it was for "the liberty and laws of the subject that he took up arms"?—a strange assertion certainly to come from a man who, besides having himself tortured one poor man named Archer, was the representative of the line of princes who had introduced torture into England against the law of England which they did not pretend to have been repealed, and who habitually broke

the law of England which commanded that a prisoner and his accuser should be brought face to face.

King Charles also said, "If it were only my own particular case, I would have satisfied myself with the protestation I made the last time I was here against the legality of this court, and that a king cannot be tried by any jurisdiction on earth; but it is not my case alone, it is the freedom and the liberty of the people of England; and do you pretend what you will, I stand more for their liberties."

This is a strange assertion, and yet so little was generally known of the course of government in that age, it obtained some degree of credence. Where a free press did not exist, though every district in England no doubt had had some experience of the oppressive government of Charles, that particular district might fancy itself an exception, and being kept ignorant of what was done in other districts, might believe it possible that somewhere in England King Charles might be the protector of the laws and liberties of Englishmen. It is commonly supposed that men will speak truth on the near approach of death. Yet the Earl of Strafford on the scaffold declared what his whole life had given the lie to—that he had always been a friend to Parliaments—unless he meant to equivocate, and to say he was a friend to such Parliaments as he had called together when Lord-Deputy of Ireland merely for the purpose of carrying out the despotic views of himself and his master Charles under Parliamentary forms.

But the words of King Charles quoted above that contain the whole question as to the mode of proceeding adopted by the Independents are these: "The protestation I made the last time I was here against the legality of this court, and that a king cannot be tried by any jurisdiction

on earth." Now this position, "that a king cannot be tried by any jurisdiction on earth," may or may not have been taken up from King James's "True Law of Free Monarchies;" but whether it was or was not based upon that, or upon any other perversion of the Hebrew Scriptures, it was altogether an untenable position as soon as any nation or tribe of men to whom some tyrant propounded it should have emancipated themselves from the slavery under which the English had lived under the Tudors and the two Stuarts, James and Charles. Battles make kings.[1] Battles made William I. and Henry VII. kings of England. I have said before that the Tudors in changing the law of England as to torture and witnesses did not pretend a new conquest—and yet the battle of Bosworth made the Tudors kings, but it was chiefly won by English against English. So were the battles of Marston Moor and Naseby; and the Independents who won them had as much right to set up a new government as the Tudors had after the battle of Bosworth. The Independents had defeated the King and his adherents in many decisive battles. They were therefore an independent state set up by the God of battles; and they should have tried King Charles as a prisoner of war who had carried on war in a manner that worked a forfeiture of his life; besides being the representative and imitator of a line of tyrants who having oppressed the people of England by cruel trials and tortures which were against the law of England, was fit to be made a public example and warning to all such tyrants in time to come.

Ludlow in his Memoirs gives a report of the King's

[1] That many of the officers of the Parliamentary army were quite aware of this appears from the statement of Richard Baxter given in a note near the end of the last chapter.

trial, which though short is clear and more coherent and intelligible than the longer reports. Ludlow's report also contains Bradshaw's answer, which is not recorded in any other report of the trial which I have met with, to the King's repeated assertions that he was not accountable to man for anything he did. "The King," says Ludlow, "demurred to the jurisdiction of the court, affirming that no man, nor body of men, had power to call him to an account, being not entrusted by man, and therefore accountable only to God for his actions; entering into a large discourse of his being in treaty with the Parliament's commissioners at the Isle of Wight, and his being taken from thence he knew not how, when he thought he was come to a conclusion with them. This discourse seeming not to the purpose, the President told him, that as to his plea of not being accountable to man, seeing God by his Providence had overruled it, the court had resolved to do so also; and that if he would give no other answer, that which he had given should be registered, and they would proceed as if he had confessed the charge: in order to which the President commanded his answer to be entered, directing Serjeant Dendy, who attended the court, to withdraw the prisoner; which as he was doing, many persons cried out in the hall, *Justice, Justice.*"[1]

Of the depositions of the witnesses called to prove that Charles had been in arms against the people of England, the most important is that of Henry Gooche, which, confirmed as it has been by the private letters of Charles, completely contradicts his statement made in court of his thinking he had come to a conclusion in his treaty with the Parliament's commissioners in the Isle of Wight. Henry Gooche said that "on the 30th of September last

[1] Ludlow's Memoirs, i. 277, 278. Second edition. London, 1721.

he was in the Isle of Wight, that having access to and discourse with the King, the King said that he would have all his old friends know that though for the present he was contented to give the Parliament leave to call their own war what they pleased, yet that he neither did at that time, nor ever should, decline the justice of his own cause. And when the deponent said that the business was much retarded through want of commissions, the King answered that he being upon a treaty would not dishonour himself; but that if the deponent would go over to the Prince his son (who had full authority from him), he or any from him should receive whatsoever commissions should be desired."[1]

When Oliver St. John, as Solicitor-General, carried up to the Lords the bill of attainder against the Earl of Strafford, he in his speech on that occasion made use of a form of expression which has been often quoted and much criticised. "My Lords," he said, "he that would not have had others to have a law, why should he have any himself? Why should not that be done to him that himself would have done to others? It is true we give law to hares and deer, because they be beasts of chase: it was never accounted either cruelty or foul play to knock foxes and wolves on the head as they can be found, because these be beasts of prey. The warrener sets traps for polecats and other vermin, for preservation of the warren."[2] St. John here argues the case as a statesman, while Pym argued it neither as a statesman nor as a lawyer, but merely as an orator. For as all the laws against treason in England had been made to protect the King and not the subject, it was not to be expected that the English

[1] Howell's State Trials, iv. 994, *et seq.*, and for Gooche's evidence, p. 1090.
[2] Rushworth, viii. 703.

law of treason should contain any power to punish an aggressor who strove, as Strafford unquestionably had done, to make the English king absolute and Englishmen slaves. Consequently when Pym says that "nothing can be more equal than that he should perish by the justice of that law, which he would have subverted;" "that there are marks enough to trace this law to the very original of this kingdom;" and that "if it hath not been put in execution for 240 years, it was not for want of law,"[1] he speaks rhetorically, and assumes the existence of a law which did not exist. St. John, on the other hand, put the case upon its true basis—that he whose proved purpose had been to reduce Englishmen to the condition of slaves having no law but the will of an absolute king, should be destroyed as a public enemy, or a dangerous and noxious beast of prey.

This argument applies also to King Charles. If Charles's minister the Earl of Strafford was to be destroyed as a noxious beast of prey, Charles himself, by whose command and on whose behalf Strafford acted, might consider himself not human but divine if he escaped. For as to the maxim that "the King can do no wrong," it may be considered as disposed of in the passage quoted in the preceding chapter from the Remonstrance of the army demanding justice upon the King, as one of those court maxims concerning the absolute impunity of kings "begotten by the blasphemous arrogance of tyrants upon servile parasites." Some of the Jacobite writers on this subject have complained that "the maxim that the King can do no wrong, which is now rationally understood as only implying the settled doctrine of ministerial responsibility, is absolutely denied by the republican

[1] Rushworth, viii. 669, 670.

lawyer" (Cook, the Solicitor-General for the trial of the King). It is not surprising that what the writer calls "the settled doctrine of ministerial responsibility" should not be recognised by Cook in $164\frac{8}{9}$, when it only became the "settled" doctrine after the Revolution of 1688. There was no such settled doctrine at that time ($164\frac{8}{9}$), and even now if a king's minister or lieutenant were to treat any Englishman, Scotchman, or Irishman, as Montrose, acting as King Charles's lieutenant, treated the people of Aberdeen, a question might arise as to the limits of ministerial responsibility—a question which might assume a very grave aspect.

As the Scots had taken a totally different view of matters both spiritual and temporal from the settled opinions of the Independents, and as the difference of opinion had even broken out into open war, the Independents, who were now the ruling power in England, might have found some difficulty in procuring witnesses to prove the atrocities committed by King Charles's lieutenant at Aberdeen. But even if they should have been unable to bring up the witnesses themselves, if they could have procured the depositions of some of the citizens of Aberdeen who had survived the massacre, those depositions being read in open court must have produced an effect not only throughout Britain, but over the whole world wherever there were human beings who could read a translation of the atrocities of this King, who was so fond of his people, according to the language of his parasites. They should have distinctly stated that they had renounced allegiance to him as a king when they met him only on fields of battle, that they now treated him as a prisoner of war, and passed sentence on him as a prisoner of war who had carried on war in a manner which worked

a forfeiture of his own life. I do not know that it is necessary; but as so much pains have been taken by the Royalist and Jacobite writers to excite compassion for this King in their "stories" of his trial and execution, I will shortly repeat what I have said elsewhere of the Aberdeen massacre perpetrated by Montrose's Highland and Irish barbarians on the citizens of Aberdeen, their wives and children.

To show that I do not give the evidence of doubtful witnesses as to the Aberdeen massacre, I will quote the words of Sir Walter Scott himself: "Many were killed in the streets; and the cruelty of the Irish in particular was so great, that they compelled the wretched citizens to strip themselves of their clothes before they killed them, to prevent their being soiled with blood. The women durst not lament their husbands or their fathers slaughtered in their presence, nor inter the dead which remained unburied in the streets until the Irish departed."[1] There were other frightful outrages committed on the women and children which Sir Walter Scott does not mention. Of the man who let loose those barbarians on the people of Scotland, and the man who directed their movements when let loose, I will quote here what I have said elsewhere: "It is not easy to analyse the heart of that man who in his dying hour could look without remorse or even regret on those four days of September 1644, including that Sunday, the 15th of September, when there was neither preaching nor praying in Aberdeen, and nothing but the death-groans of men and the shrieks and wail of women through all the streets, and when the King's lieutenant, who had in the name of 'King Charles the

[1] History of Scotland, contained in "Tales of a Grandfather," vol. i. chap. xlii. p. 437. Edition, Edinburgh, 1846.

Good[1] caused all these things, could not enter or leave his quarters in Skipper Anderson's[2] house without walking upon, or over the bloody corpses of those not slain in battle, and over streets slippery with innocent blood. Montrose's chaplain and panegyrical biographer, Bishop Wishart, has prudently thought fit to pass over the proceedings of his hero in Aberdeen altogether in silence. Montrose himself declared that he had never shed blood except in battle. But the facts are proved by Spalding, a townsman of Aberdeen, present on the occasion, who was firmly attached to Episcopacy and the King's cause, and a wellwisher to the general success of Montrose. Spalding must consequently in this case have been an unwilling witness, and his testimony may therefore be considered as conclusive. We therefore have before us the strange phenomenon of a man, who cannot be considered as a pure barbarian by blood, birth, and education, performing deeds that place him on a moral level with Nana Sahib, and for what? to enable King Charles I. to do with impunity whatever had been done by King James, who had murdered by divine right two of Montrose's uncles, the Earl of Gowrie and Alexander Ruthven. . . . Let any one place himself in the situation, not of a man who had lost his male relatives in battle against Montrose—that would have been a thing in the ordinary course of events—but of a man whose fields had been laid waste, whose house had been burned, whose father, mother, wife, daughters, sisters had been butchered by Montrose, and then let him say whether he would have considered Montrose entitled to the treatment of a generous and honourable enemy? Nay more—if there was a man wearing a crown who commissioned this Montrose, and who avowed and sought to

[1] Spalding, ii. 266.

profit by his atrocities—will any man say there was no good done by making such a man, though wearing a crown and called a king, know that he had a joint in his neck?"[1]

These facts are a conclusive answer to those writers who say that the Independents should have proceeded "by a direct and manful charge against the King of those violations of the constitution and stretches of the prerogative which were complained of, instead of jesuitically and inhumanly putting him on his trial for treason and murder on account of bloodshed in open and equal warfare." "Bloodshed in open and equal warfare!" when Montrose's cut-throats compelled the wretched citizens of Aberdeen to strip themselves before they killed them, to prevent their clothes being soiled with blood. Was this bloodshed in open and equal warfare? If a king is to commission men or fiends to do such things and is to go unpunished, earth is at once turned into hell. There is nothing recorded of Alva worse than this. And if Alva's master had fallen into the gripe of the Netherlanders or Hollanders, as Montrose's master had fallen into the gripe of the Independents, it would matter little whether or not the Netherlanders or Hollanders could have proved that he had committed *treason* against *them*, but they certainly would have had a strong case against *him* as a *tyrant*, *murderer*, and *public enemy*. Such was Charles I., and as such the Independents were resolved that he should die.

On the 26th of January, the sixth day of the trial, the commissioners were engaged in preparing the sentence, having then determined that it should be death. A question was raised as to his deposition previously to his exe-

[1] History of the Commonwealth of England, i. 293-297. London: John Murray, Albemarle Street, 1864.

cution, but it was postponed, and the sentence, with a blank for the manner of death, was drawn up by Ireton, Harrison, Henry Marten, Scot, Say, Lisle, and Love, and ordered to be engrossed.

On the following day, the 27th of January, the seventh day of the trial, the high court of justice met for the last time in Westminster Hall. The President, who had hitherto worn plain black, was robed in scarlet, and most of the commissioners, the number of whom present on that day was sixty-seven, seventy-one being the largest number ever present on any former day of the trial, were "in their best habits." As the King passed up the hall, a loud cry was heard of "Justice! Justice! Execution! Execution!" The soldiers, as had happened before, had begun to distrust their leaders, and to suspect that as six days had been allowed to pass without judgment, the King would be allowed to escape; and this circumstance corroborates the opinion of those who think that the scheme of inflicting capital punishment on the King spread from the ranks upwards, and not from the leaders downwards.[1] One of the soldiers upon guard said, "God bless you, sir!" The King thanked him, but his officer struck the man with his cane. "Methinks," said the King, "the punishment exceeds the offence." With this exception of the cry for justice, that soldiery maintained throughout the whole of that trying scene—for it was trying to them as well as to the prisoner and his judges—the character for discipline, for self-control, for good conduct, which more even than their valour has rendered them unequalled upon earth. Even according to the testimony of Herbert, the captive King was treated with all the respect and consideration compatible with the

[1] See *ante*, chap. xix.

duty which the court had to perform; and the King's judges might truly say that throughout the whole of that momentous struggle not one assassination was ever committed by them or any of their party; that they acted neither with a mean nor a timid spirit, and that what they did was not done in a corner, but openly and fearlessly in the eyes of all mankind. Sentence of death, by severing the head from the body, was now pronounced. Before the sentence was read, Bradshaw made a long speech on the King's misgovernment, in the course of which he mentioned the cases of many kings who had been deposed by their subjects, none of which were precisely parallel cases. So that there might be some truth in the remark of the writers who say that there was more pedantry than discretion in all Bradshaw's references to history for precedents; since the present case was unprecedented, and was to form a precedent to after-ages, fraught with the momentous truth that kings as well as other men had a joint in their necks, and that they must abandon the imagination that they could commit rapine and murder with perfect impunity.

The warrant for execution "upon the morrow, being the thirtieth day of this instant month of January," was signed on Monday in the Painted Chamber; and the place assigned was the open street before the banqueting-house at Whitehall, now Whitehall Chapel, one of the windows of which was opened that the King might walk out to a scaffold erected before it. Having slept for more than four hours, the King awoke before daybreak on Tuesday the 30th of January, and called Herbert, who lay on a pallet by his side. The King had always a large cake of wax which, set in a silver basin, burned during the whole night, and as by it he perceived that Herbert

was disturbed in his sleep, he desired to know his dream. Herbert repeated it, and the King said it was very remarkable, being about his seeing Archbishop Laud enter that room and confer with the King. Charles then saying, "Herbert, this is my second marriage-day; I would be as trim to-day as may be, for before night I hope to be espoused to my blessed Jesus," appointed the clothes he would wear, and added, "Let me have a shirt on more than ordinary, by reason the season is so sharp as probably may make me shake, which some observers will imagine proceeds from fear. I would have no such imputation. I fear not death. Death is not terrible to me. I bless my God I am prepared." The King had desired the attendance of Juxon, formerly Bishop of London, and his request had been granted. Juxon joined them at an appointed hour and assisted Charles in his devotion; after which the King delivered to Herbert some presents for his children, accompanied by advice for their future conduct."[1]

Towards ten o'clock Colonel Hacker, who was commissioned to conduct the King to the scaffold, knocked gently at the door of the chamber. Charles having said, "Let him come in, the Colonel in a trembling manner came near and told His Majesty it was time to go to Whitehall, where he might have some further time to rest."[2] About ten o'clock the King went out with firmness. Several companies of foot were drawn up in the park on either side as he passed. Charles walked erect and very fast. A body of halberdiers went before and another behind him. On his right hand was Bishop Juxon; and on his left was Colonel Tomlinson, with whom he conversed on the way. He was followed by some of his own gentlemen

[1] Herbert, p. 124, *et seq.* [2] Ibid., p. 132.

and servants, who walked bareheaded. The drums beat all the time. His Majesty, says Herbert, heard many of the crowd pray for him, "the soldiers not rebuking any of them; by their silence and dejected faces seeming afflicted rather than insulting." [1]

When he reached Whitehall, passing through the long gallery he went into his old cabinet-chamber. There, the scaffold not being quite ready, he passed the time in prayer with the Bishop. About twelve o'clock he drank a glass of claret wine and ate a piece of bread; and then he went with Juxon, Tomlinson, Hacker, and the guards through the banqueting-house to the scaffold, which was hung with black, the floor being also covered with black and the axe and block laid in the middle of it. Bodies of horse and foot were drawn up on all sides of the scaffold, and there was a vast concourse of people; but as the latter could not approach near enough to hear him, he addressed a speech to the gentlemen upon the scaffold. Like his two ministers Strafford and Laud, who had gone before him, he made solemn protestations of his regard for the laws of England and for the ancient rights and liberties of the English people. But deeds are stronger than words, and in his case, as in the cases of Laud and Strafford, the actions of his life, confirmed by his own letters, belied the words uttered on the scaffold.

The King said that he would have held his tongue were it not that as some might impute his silence to an acknowledgment of guilt, he deemed it a duty to God, his country, and himself, to vindicate his character as an honest man, a good king, and a good Christian. He imputed the war to the Parliament in their proceeding about the militia. He said that with regard to the blood which

[1] Herbert, p. 134.

had been spilt he could not charge himself with it, though he reckoned his fate a just retribution for the death of Strafford: that as to his being a good Christian he appealed to Juxon whether he had not heartily forgiven his enemies; and that his charity went farther, as he wished them to repent of the great sin they had committed, and bring back matters to their legitimate channel. What he meant by this he then sufficiently showed, and showed at the same time in what sense he died a martyr, not of or for the people, as he expressed it, but a martyr to those principles of despotism which it had been the one object of his life to put in practice. He said that things would never be well till God had his due, the King his, and the people theirs. What the people's due was, in his opinion, he explained sufficiently by assuring them that the people ought never to have a share in the government, *that* being a thing "nothing pertaining to them, and that he died the martyr of the people." Whether he died the martyr of the people or the martyr of monarchical tyranny let the people judge. He concluded with these words: "In truth I would have desired some time longer, because that I would have put this that I have said in a little more order and a little better digested than I have done; and therefore I hope you will excuse me. I have delivered my conscience. I pray God that you may take those courses that are best for the good of the kingdom and your own salvation."

At the desire of Juxon he declared that he died a Protestant according to the doctrine of the Church of England. While he was speaking one of the gentlemen on the scaffold touched the edge of the axe, and Charles evinced his presence of mind by desiring him to take heed of the axe. Two men in visors stood by the block. To one of them the King said, "I shall say but very short

prayers, and then thrust out my hands for the signal." His hair he put under a satin nightcap with the assistance of Juxon and the executioner; and then, turning to the Bishop, he said, "I have a good cause and a gracious God on my side." "You have now," said Juxon, "but one stage more: the stage is turbulent and troublesome, but it is a short one: it will carry you a very great way: it will carry you from earth to heaven." "I go," said Charles, "from a corruptible to an incorruptible crown, where no disturbance can be." "You are exchanged from a temporal to an eternal crown, a good exchange," was the reply of the Bishop. The King then took off his cloak, and, giving his *George* to Juxon with the single word "Remember," laid his head upon the block and stretched out his hands. The executioner severed the neck at one blow, and the other man in the mask held up the head and cried out, "This is the head of a traitor." Among the spectators many wept, and some strove to dip their handkerchiefs in his blood, as in the blood of a martyr.[1]

In regard to the numerous statements that have been put forth respecting the King's trial and execution, it is in the first place to be observed that Herbert, who was in constant attendance upon the King, is an authority beyond all question. Clarendon and Warwick were not even in England at the time, and yet they have taken upon them to impute to the soldiers of the Parliament of England acts of brutality and insolence towards the fallen and captive King which were not only totally alien to all that is known of the character and habits of those soldiers, even from the admission of hostile witnesses, of such writers as Clarendon himself and Pepys, but are positively disproved by Herbert's statement of the facts, whereof he was a

[1] Herbert, p. 134. Rush., vii. 1429, 1430. Whitelock, pp. 374, 375.

witness. Charles on his return to St. James's having asked Herbert whether he heard the cry for justice, Herbert answered that he did and "marvelled thereat." Whereupon Charles said, "So did not I, for I am well assured that the soldiers bear no malice to me. The cry was no doubt given by their officers, for whom the soldiers would do the like were there occasion." Herbert's statement is confirmed by Whitelock. The King was in all probability mistaken as to the cry's having been given by their officers. But at any rate this is conclusive evidence that the cry for justice—the expression of the soldiers' impatience and of their doubts that the court would not after all proceed to execution—was the only act in the shape of insult which occurred on that memorable occasion. Hume has recorded all the grossest fabrications of the Royalist writers, even while—as appeared from his pencil-marks in the books he used (but some of which he took care not to cite) in the Advocates' Library, of which he was librarian when he wrote his history—he knew them to be false.[1]

Hume, whose narrative was for a series of years accepted as the popular interpretation of this period of English history, has even gone beyond some of the most unscrupulous of the Royalist martyrologists—Hume who wrote the celebrated essay on miracles; and who in the contrasts presented in himself between the philosopher searching for truth and the advocate seeking to support a case has in his own person favoured the world with something of the miraculous—with something at least exceeding the ordinary course of nature. Some writers, relying on the evidence given on the trial of Hacker—where, as on

[1] His pencil-marks in the copy of Herbert and in the copy of Perinchief belonging to the Advocates' Library prove that Hume knew the true and the false statements, and for the purpose of effect deliberately adopted the false.

the trials of the other regicides, the witnesses perjured themselves, as is evident from a comparison of their testimony with the statements of Herbert, Berkeley, and others, who as thorough Royalists cannot be supposed to have suppressed or disguised the truth in favour of the King's enemies—say that the King lay at Whitehall on Saturday night and was carried to St. James's on Sunday morning. But Herbert distinctly states that he was at St. James's from first to last, and walked thence through the park to Whitehall on the morning of his execution. Even Clement Walker, whom Hume cites at the bottom of the page as his authority for the assertion that "every night during the interval"—from the sentence to the execution, that is, from Saturday to Tuesday—"the King slept sound as usual, though the noise of the workmen, employed in framing the scaffold, and other preparations for his execution, continually resounded in his ears," does not bear Hume out in this deliberate falsehood, and refutes himself. For after asserting that "the King lay at Whitehall Saturday (the day of his sentence) and Sunday night," Clement Walker proceeds thus: "Tuesday, 30th January 1648 [$164\frac{8}{9}$], was the day appointed for the King's death: he came on foot from St. James's to Whitehall that morning."[1] Clement Walker's character as a scurrilous and mendacious writer is well known to all who have studied the original authorities for the history of that time; but it is not always that such a habitually-mendacious writer furnishes matter to refute himself as Walker has here done.

But this is not all, for Hume takes from Perinchief, the writer of a life of Charles prefixed to that King's alleged works, though Perinchief was an authority Hume did not

[1] History of Independency, second part, p. 110.

think fit to refer to, some of the wildest inventions of the Royalist party as to the effects of this execution—as that "some unmindful of themselves, *as they could not or would not survive their beloved prince, it is reported, suddenly fell down dead.*" There is one part of the story, however, which the writer of the essay on miracles has omitted to mention —the account of the miracles which were worked by handkerchiefs dipped in the royal martyr's blood. Hume also stops short of Perinchief in the application of the falsehoods respecting the conduct of the soldiers, for Perinchief makes use of them in order that he may compare the treatment of Charles by the Independents to the treatment of Christ by the Jews. Hume is also silent on the subject of the "Eikon," of which Perinchief thus expresses himself: "A sober reader cannot tell what to admire most, his incredible prudence, his ardent piety, or his majestic and truly royal style. Those parts of it which consisted of addresses to God corresponded so nearly in the occasions, and were so full of the piety and elegance of David's psalms, that they seemed to be dictated by the same spirit."[1]

The writer of this passage, who was a doctor of divinity, in the same page in which he so characterises Dr. John Gauden's forgery, thus describes Milton: "They hired certain mercenary souls to despoil the King of the credit of being the author of it [the 'Eikon']: especially one base scribe naturally fitted to compose satires and invent re-

[1] Life of Charles I., by Perinchief, prefixed to King Charles's [alleged] Works, p. 94. Mr. Forster has observed (Life of Henry Marten, p. 309, note): "In Rushworth, vii. 1425, we find the words put into Charles's mouth on the cry of the soldiers, 'Poor souls! for a piece of money they would do as much for their commanders.' But it is not denied that several of the latter parts of Rushworth's Collections were tampered with after his death, and before their publication. The words in question are in fact copied from Sanderson, p. 1132. Milton (Defensio Secunda) has given himself the trouble to contradict the tale that one of the soldiers was destroyed for saying God bless you, sir."

proaches, who made himself notorious by some licentious and infamous pamphlets, and so approved himself as fit for their service. This man they encouraged (by translating him from a needy pedagogue to the office of a secretary) to write that scandalous work, *Εἰκονοκλάστης* (an invective against the King's meditations), and to answer the learned Salmasius his defence of Charles the First." This was published under royal sanction in 1662. We see, then, that it was not altogether without cause that, "fallen on evil days and evil tongues, Milton appealed to the avenger Time." And Time has redressed the balance between him and his enemies.

The history of this work, which perhaps may more correctly be termed a religious than a literary forgery, is curious and instructive. So late as the years 1824 and 1828 no less a person than the Master of Trinity College, Cambridge, the Rev. Christopher Wordsworth, D.D., produced two elaborate volumes on the authorship of "Icon Basilike," which he unhesitatingly ascribed to Charles I. The first volume is entitled "Who wrote *Εικὼν Βασιλικὴ*, considered and answered." The second volume is entitled "King Charles the First the Author of 'Icon Basilike' further proved, in a Letter to his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, in Reply to the Objections of Dr. Lingard, Mr. Todd, Mr. Broughton, the 'Edinburgh Review,' and Mr. Hallam."

More than twenty years after the publication of Dr. Christopher Wordsworth's volumes, a celebrated writer, who had been a Fellow of the same distinguished college of which Dr. Christopher Wordsworth was master, and had also been a Fellow, ascribed the authorship of "Icon Basilike" as unhesitatingly to Dr. John Gauden as Dr. Wordsworth had ascribed it to King Charles I. "In the

year 1692," says Lord Macaulay, "an honest old clergyman named Walker, who had, in the time of the civil war, been intimately acquainted with Dr. John Gauden, wrote a book which convinced all sensible and dispassionate readers that Gauden, and not Charles I., was the author of the 'Icon Basilike.' This book Fraser—the licenser—suffered to be printed. If he had authorised the publication of a work in which the Gospel of Saint John or the Epistle to the Romans had been represented as spurious, the indignation of the High Church party could hardly have been greater. The question was not literary but religious. Doubt was impiety. The Blessed Martyr was an inspired penman, his 'Icon' a supplementary revelation. One grave divine indeed had gone so far as to propose that lessons taken out of the inestimable little volume should be read in the churches."[1]

I have not seen the book which, according to Lord Macaulay, "convinced all sensible and dispassionate readers;" and I am inclined to think that Lord Macaulay has not strengthened his position by the expression of his opinion, that all who should not be convinced by Walker's book exactly as he was convinced were hot-headed fools; though it is very possible that many of such persons might be neither sensible nor dispassionate. But probably, everything considered, Dr. John Gauden himself is even a more important witness than this old clergyman named Walker; and Gauden states in a letter to Clarendon, printed among the "Clarendon Papers," that he wrote the *Εικών*, and further, that Charles II. was satisfied that he wrote it.[2]

It is said that James I., soon after his arrival in Eng-

[1] Macaulay's History of England, iii. 399. London, 1864.
[2] Clarendon Papers, vol. iii. Supplt. p. 29.

land, in conversing with some of his English counsellors about his prerogative, exclaimed joyously, "Do I make the judges? Do I make the bishops? Then, God's wounds! I make what likes me law and gospel!" The case of Dr. John Gauden and "Icon Basilike" is a remarkable example of the truth of this exclamation. Gauden was desirous of being made a bishop, as appears from several letters of his in the supplement to the third volume of the "Clarendon Papers." With the view of finding favour in the sight of those who had the power of making bishops, he wrote a book purporting to be meditations of Charles I., of which Perinchief says, "It was imagined that the admiration of following ages might bring it into the canon of holy writings, because it corresponded so nearly with the occasions, and was so full of the piety and elegance of David's Psalms, that it seemed to be dictated by the same spirit." It was, in fact, dictated by the love of a bishopric, as Gauden's urgent applications sufficiently show. And as Gauden under this stimulus wrote a book which is said to have gone through fifty editions in the first year, and passed for gospel with Samuel Johnson[1] and many other Jacobites, whatever its merits as a literary composition may be, King James's saying came true, that as he made the bishops he made what liked him gospel. On the 3d of November 1660, John Gauden, Master of the Temple, was elected Bishop of Exeter, and translated to Worcester 23d May 1662; ob. 10th September following, æt. 57.[2]

[1] In Johnson's Dictionary Gauden is always quoted under the title of "King Charles."

[2] Succession of Archbishops and Bishops from the Conquest to the Present Time, at the end of Sir Harris Nicolas's Synopsis of the Peerage of England.

It may be truly said that the death of King Charles I. delivered Parliamentary government from an implacable enemy, whose power to work mischief has abundantly been manifested in the preceding pages; but whose death was to break the spell of inviolability and consequent impunity for crimes that had by the divine-right fictions of the preceding two centuries been woven round kings.

# INDEX.

ABERDEEN, four days' massacre at, by Charles I.'s lieutenant, Montrose, ii. 121–125.

Administration, the, of Laud and Strafford, i. 71–116.

Agmondesham, a public theological disputation held in the church of, between some of the soldiers of the Parliamentary army and some sectaries, which lasted from morning till night before a crowded congregation, ii. 213, note.

Airlie, the Earl of, and two of his sons join Montrose, ii. 120.

Antrim, Randolph Macdonnell, Earl of, a commission granted to, by Charles I., to raise an army of native Irish to be employed against Scotland, i. 226, 227. Scheme concerted with the Queen that Antrim should with a large body of Irish invade Scotland, and act in concert with Montrose, i. 288–290. Laid claim, as representative of the Lords of the Isles, to certain parts of the Highlands and Isles then held by the Argyle family, ii. 110. His scheme of invading Argyle's country, with the sanction of King Charles, to have "whatever land he can conquer from them," ii. 111, 112. His scheme objected to by Wentworth as impracticable, ii. 112. Burnet's opinion of Antrim, ii. 113. Irish auxiliaries sent to join Montrose under the command of Alexander Macdonnell, called Colkitto, a Scottish Islesman, related to Antrim, ii. 114.

Archer, John, his case the last case of torture in England, i. 166.

Argyle, Archibald Campbell, Marquis of, burns the vessels that brought over Montrose's Irish auxiliaries, and follows Montrose with a strong force, but does not overtake him, ii. 117, 126. Embarks on board a fishing-boat when Montrose breaks into Argyleshire, ii. 127. Is defeated by Montrose at Inverlochy, ii. 133–135. Interferes with General Baillie in the command of the armies of the Covenanters, which consequently were defeated and ruined, ii. 160. Is defeated by Montrose at Kilsyth, ii. 161–163.

Army, the King's, composition of, i. 266, 267.

Army, Parliamentary, composition of, i. 266; remodelled, ii. 138; composition of, ii. 212 and note.

Army adjutators, councils of, ii. 213 and note, 214, 215. Resolve on obtaining possession of the King's person, having come to

the conclusion that he was a prisoner of war, captured by their success in defeating his armies, and that as such prisoner of war his fate depended on the manner in which he had carried on war, ii. 215, 216.

BAILLIE, Lieutenant-General, found himself at Kilsyth and Preston "slighted in everything belonging to a commander-in-chief," ii. 160. Taken prisoner with a great part of the Scotch army, when Hamilton was defeated by Cromwell in Lancashire, ii. 274.

Basing House, the storming of, ii. 169–171.

Basset, with Godolphin, led one of the divisions of the Royalists at the battle of Stratton, i. 298.

Basset, Philip, the last Chief Justiciary of England, i. 299, note.

Basset, Ralph, of Drayton, slain at Evesham with Simon de Montfort, i. 299, 300.

Basset, Richard, of Weldon, Chief Justiciary of England under Richard I., Sir Simonds D'Ewes's account of a seal of, i. 299, note.

Bastwick, persecution of, by Laud, i. 96, 101.

Berkeley, Sir John, with Sir Bevill Grenville, led one of the divisions of the Royalists at the battle of Stratton, i. 298. His Memoirs partly incorporated into Ludlow's Memoirs, ii. 229. His conferences on behalf of the King with Cromwell and Ireton, ii. 229, 230. His account of the King's ungracious reception of the Proposals of the army, ii. 233. Sent by the King from the Isle of Wight with letters to Fairfax, Cromwell, and Ireton, ii. 247. His cold reception, ii. 248.

Black, David, a Scotch Presbyterian minister, claims spiritual power equal to that claimed by the Church of Rome, i. 143, 144.

Blake, Robert, colonel, afterwards the great admiral of the Commonwealth, defends Lyme with great ability, ii. 80. Contrast between his defence of Lyme and Taunton and Rupert's defence of Bristol, ii. 169.

Blake, Samuel, brother of the preceding, killed in a quarrel with a Royalist captain of array, and one of his followers, i. 251, 252.

Bradshaw, John, appointed their president by the commissioners for the trial of the King, ii. 312 and note.

Brentford, the King's attack on, i. 282.

Broghill, Lord, afterwards Earl of Orrery, the story told to, by Cromwell of the letter from King Charles to the Queen, said to have been intercepted by Cromwell and Ireton at the Blue Boar Inn in Holborn, ii. 234–237 and note.

Brooke, Lord, killed while engaged in the siege of Litchfield Close, i. 295, 296.

Brownist, a term of reproach used by the Court party for those who

were also called Puritans, another term of reproach, derived from Robert Brown, a clergyman of the reign of Elizabeth, who is said to have been the first person in England who publicly avowed the principles of English Independency, i. 272, 273.

Bruis, Robert de, the first who held the office of Chief-Justice of the King's Bench, appointed 52 Hen. III., when the office of Chief Justiciary of England was discontinued, i. 299, note.

Buckingham, George Villiers, Duke of, minion of James I. and minister of Charles I., who in making such an appointment inflicted an insult upon Englishmen, than which no greater had been offered to a nation since the time when Caligula destined his horse for the consulship, i. 45. His impeachment by the House of Commons, i. 51–53. His assassination by John Felton, i. 70.

Burton, persecution of, by Laud, i. 96, 101.

Byron, Sir John, afterwards Lord Byron, licentiousness and want of discipline of the troops under his command, i. 280.

Byron, Lord, defeated at Nantwich by Sir Thomas Fairfax, ii. 41. His impetuosity, by dashing over the ditch that separated the armies at Marston Moor, threw his men into some disorder, and gave Cromwell some advantages, ii. 56. Four of his brothers slain in the battle of Marston Moor, ii. 60, note.

CARLISLE, Lucy Percy, Countess of, one of the most celebrated women whose portraits have been painted by Vandyke, i. 191. Is said to have given Pym private information of the King's design to take away by force the five accused members of the House of Commons—a warning which was thought to have prevented bloodshed, i. 245. Cromwell told Berkeley that he had traced to her a story that he had been promised the vacant title of Earl of Essex, and the post of Commander of the Guard; and that she alleged she had received her intelligence from Berkeley himself, ii. 184. Meetings of Royalists and Presbyterians at her lodgings in Whitehall for holding correspondence with the Queen of England, then in France, with an intent to put conditions upon the Parliament, and to bring in the King upon their own terms, ii. 190, note. A daughter of the Earl of Northumberland, she had been married when young to one of King James's favourites, and now, no longer a youthful beauty, had turned a Presbyterian, and exerted her abilities for intrigue to destroy Cromwell, ii. 243.

Charles I., accession and character of, i. 38–41. In the beginning of his reign governed by Buckingham, i. 39. The French ambassador's opinion of, i. 43. First Parliament of, i. 43, 44. Second Parliament of, i. 48. Third Parliament of, i. 59. (See Parliament.) Gives his assent to the Petition of Right, i. 66. Reigns for eleven years without Parliaments, and violates the

Petition of Right, by the illegal imprisonment of Sir John Eliot and others, i. 70; by the illegal imposition of taxes, such as ship-money, i. 117, 118; by the mutilation of Prynne and others, i. 88; by the extension of the royal forests, and building the walls before people consented to part with their land, i. 108; by removing some judges from their places for refusing to act against their oaths and consciences, and threatening others so that they durst not do their duties, i. 86 and note, and 118. His attempt to coerce the Scottish Presbyterians, i. 141, 153; defeated by a tumult at Edinburgh and resisted throughout Scotland, i. 156–158. Calls his fourth Parliament after an interval of eleven years, i. 163. Dissolves it, i. 164. Calls his fifth Parliament—the Long Parliament, i. 167. His conduct in regard to the Irish insurrection and massacre of English Protestants, i. 225–227 and notes. Impeaches and attempts to seize the five members, i. 242, 243. Leaves London, to which he never returned till brought thither a prisoner, i. 248. Prepares for war against the Parliament, i. 250–263. Raises his standard at Nottingham, i. 262, 263. Composition of his army as compared with that of the Parliament at the beginning of the war, i. 266, 267. Tells his army they would meet no enemies but traitors, most of them Brownists, Anabaptists, and Atheists, who would destroy both Church and Commonwealth, i. 272. His letter to the Earl of Newcastle to raise an army of Roman Catholics, though with the most solemn oaths he denied the fact, and said there were more Papists in the Parliament's army than in his, i. 271, 272. His conduct as to the Treaty of Uxbridge—makes a reservation that *calling* the two Houses a Parliament was not *acknowledging* them, ii. 92, 93. Extract from one of his letters to the Queen showing how much he was under her government, ii. 93, note. Effect produced by the reading publicly of his letters taken at the battle of Naseby, showing how little his actions agreed with his words, and how much he was ruled by the will of his wife, so that peace, war, religion, and Parliament should be at her disposal, ii. 153. His intrigues through the Earl of Glamorgan with the Roman Catholics in Ireland, ii. 172–174. Letter in which he says "he hopes to be able to draw either the Presbyterians or Independents to side with him for extirpating the one the other," ii. 175. Surrenders himself to the Scots, who deliver him to the English Parliament for £200,000, ii. 176, 177. Sends privately to Ormonde, desiring him not to obey his public orders, and empowers Glamorgan to purchase the assistance of the Roman Catholics on any conditions, ii. 177. Seized by Joyce, ii. 216–220. His negotiations and intrigues with the army—"He gave us words," said Ireton, "and we paid him in his own coin," ii. 181, 229–233. Story of his letter to the

Queen said to have been intercepted by Cromwell and Ireton at the Blue Boar Inn in Holborn, ii. 235–237. His negotiations and intrigues with the Presbyterians, whom he draws on to their ruin and his own, ii. 238–241. His flight to the Isle of Wight, ii. 246. Privately signs the treaty with the Scots Commissioners known by the name of the Engagement, by which he agrees to confirm the Covenant, and to concur with the Presbyterians in extirpating the sectaries, particularly the Independents and their army, ii. 249, 250. Deprived of his chance of escape from the Isle of Wight by means of a fleet which, under the Prince of Wales, was for some weeks master of the sea, because, according to Clarendon, "some persons in France were wonderfully fearful that he should have made his escape," ii. 250–252. "Whereas the kings and queens of England for many ages past have, by their sacred touch and invocation of the name of God, cured those afflicted with the disease called the *King's evil*," &c., the confused association of ideas between royalty and the power to work miracles had much influence in raising the second civil war, ii. 259–261. Letters to Ormonde "to obey all my wife's commands, and not to obey any public command of mine," ii. 281, note. Remonstrance from Lord Fairfax and the General Council of the army to the House of Commons, demanding justice upon the King, ii. 284–288. The King's trial and execution, ii. 307–336. Cromwell's remark, "that they had to do with the hardest-hearted man upon earth," borne out by facts, such as his approval of Montrose's atrocities, and his opinion about the use of the rack, when Lord Falkland, Lord-Deputy of Ireland, applied for some warrant from the Council as to putting two priests to the rack, about which he had scruples; Secretary Conway, in his answer, saying he has mentioned his scruples to the King, "who is of opinion he may rack them, or kill them, if he thinks proper," ii. 320.

Chief Justiciary of England, meaning of the term, and difference between Chief or Grand Justiciary of England and Chief-Justice of the King's or Queen's Bench, i. 299, 300, note.

Clarendon, Edward Hyde, Earl of, his birth and education, i. 168, 169. His early associates, i. 169, 171. In looking back on some of these, compares himself to the man who viewed in the morning Rochester bridge, which he had galloped over in the night, and saw that it was broken, i. 172. Acquires the patronage of the most powerful persons about the Court, which made him be looked upon by the judges in Westminster Hall with much "condescension," i. 169, 170. In his History has displayed great ability as an advocate, i. 171, 173. Comparison between Clarendon and Thucydides, i. 174, 175. At the beginning of the Long Parliament speaks and acts on the same

side with Pym and Hampden, i. 168. After the execution of Strafford goes over to the Court, the obstacle to place and power at Court being thus removed, i. 231. Opposes the Grand Remonstrance, i. 235–240. Draws the papers in which King Charles calls the Almighty to witness his sincerity in declaring that he would never treat with the Irish rebels, while he was treating with them for the purpose of bringing in an army of them to enslave England and Scotland, i. 289 and note. This fact, and the direct opposition between the statements in his History, and those in his Life and in the Clarendon State Papers, afford a view of his character, i. 284 and note. Says that "Cromwell, in great fury, reproached him [Hyde], as chairman of a committee, for being partial," ii. 15. Insinuates more than once that Ireton, whose courage had been proved on many fields of battle, was wanting in courage, ii. 227, note. In his account of the battle of Dunbar he charges the whole Scottish nation with cowardice, and in that of the battle of Worcester he undertakes to prove that Charles II. was a brave man and his army an army of cowards—charges and statements that come particularly ill from a man who in all this war never once risked his own person. His description of the Parliamentary army in his speech to the Houses as Lord Chancellor, September 13, 1660, i. 38.

Coke, Sir Edward, when Attorney-General, insults Sir Walter Raleigh, who was brought to the bar to fight for his life, as the Duke of Norfolk said in similar circumstances, without a weapon, i. 18, 19. His exertions afterwards in preparing and carrying through Parliament the PETITION OF RIGHT, i. 59–66. His character in his later years, i. 67, 68.

Cook, John, appointed solicitor to the commissioners for the trial of the King; afterwards Chief-Justice of Munster, when Ireton was Lord-Deputy of Ireland, and by Cook's assistance established county courts, which were found so useful, that though put down at the Restoration, they were re-established in the reigns of William and Anne, ii. 313, 314.

Cotton, Sir Robert, furnishes to Sir John Eliot two precedents from his collection of ancient records, which gave such offence to King Charles that the speech of Eliot in which he cited them was afterwards referred to as the speech of the two precedents, i. 49. His library threatened to be, and afterwards taken away from him because he imparted ancient precedents to the Lower House, i. 51, note—which he requested Sir Henry Spelman to signify to the Council had been the cause of his mortal malady.

Cromwell, Oliver, complains in the House of Commons of one who "preached flat Popery," i. 68. Speaks in the House of Commons vehemently against the tyranny of Charles I. and Archbishop

Laud, i. 99. His personal appearance at the beginning of the Long Parliament, i. 177. His alleged remark that if the Remonstrance had been rejected he would have sold all he had and never seen England more, i. 238. Captain of a troop of horse at the battle of Edgehill, i. 274. His description of the troops of the Parliament and of the King's troops at the commencement of the war between the King and Parliament, ii. 4. His birth and early life, ii. 5–10. His troop of Slepe dragoons, ii. 10, 11. "A common spokesman for sectaries," ii. 8. His "tenderness towards sufferers" exemplified in Hyde's account of his "tempestuous carriage" on a committee, of which Cromwell was a member and Hyde chairman, ii. 15; and in the case of the younger Hotham, i. 321; and that of the *Bedford Level*, ii. 16, 17. Raises a regiment of horse, ii. 19. Composition of his horse, ii. 19, 20; of his dragoons, ii. 10–13. Richard Baxter's character of Cromwell, ii. 22. Cromwell's mode of using his military materials shown in the short letters to his officers from Samuel Squire's Journal, ii. 27–33. The effect of his labours in selecting and disciplining his troops shown in the skirmish at Gainsborough, ii. 36; and other skirmishes, ii. 37, 39; and most remarkably at the battle of Marston Moor, ii. 56–58; and of Naseby, ii. 149, 150. Presbyterian plot against Cromwell, the English Presbyterians headed by Essex, and the Scotch by Loudon, the Lord Chancellor of Scotland, ii. 84–88. His remarkable speech in the House of Commons on the 9th December 1644, which led to the self-denying Ordinance and the remodelling of the Parliamentary army, ii. 89. His successes after the battle of Naseby, ii. 168–171. Misrepresentations of the Royalists and Presbyterians respecting him, ii. 180–193. The Presbyterian party in the House of Commons seek to destroy him, but fail, ii. 209. Hobbes's false assertions respecting him, ii. 210–212. Distinction between Cromwell and Ireton somewhat similar to the impulsive action of genius and the more deliberate working of talent, shown in their negotiations with the King, ii. 229, 230. Lord Broghill's account of the story told him by Cromwell respecting the letter said to have been intercepted by Cromwell and Ireton at the Blue Boar Inn in Holborn, ii. 234–237 and note. Told Berkeley that he had traced the story, fabricated by the Royalists and Presbyterians, about his having been promised the title of Earl of Essex and the post of Commander of the Guard, to the Countess of Carlisle, ii. 184, 243. Sends word to Berkeley that he durst not see him; that he would serve His Majesty as long as he could, but desires him not to expect that he should perish for the King's sake, ii. 248. Another attempt of the Royalists and Presbyterians to destroy Cromwell at the breaking out of the second civil war, ii. 265; defeated, 266. Proceeds

against the Royalists in South Wales, ii. 267; defeats them, 268. Proceeds to the north of England against Langdale and Hamilton, ii. 273; defeats them, *ibid.* Proceeds to Scotland and joins with Argyle in renewing the Covenant and getting the Engagement rescinded, ii. 274. Arrives at Whitehall on the night after the Presbyterian members of the House of Commons had been expelled by the army, and declared "that he had not been acquainted with the design; yet since it was done, he was glad of it, and would endeavour to maintain it," ii. 297, 298. Mrs. Hutchinson's testimony as to the sincerity of Cromwell in urging Fairfax not to lay down his commission, ii. 305. Ludlow probably antedated, without intentional misrepresentation, the time when he first began to have doubts of Cromwell's sincerity and honesty, ii. 193, 194. His opinion of King Charles that he was "the hardest-hearted man upon earth," ii. 320. Evidence that Ludlow was in error in saying that Cromwell immediately after the battle of Worcester entertained designs against the Parliament, as shown by his dismissing and sending home the militia, ii. 191, 192. The sincere respect also which, by the concurrent testimony of many witnesses, Cromwell entertained for Ireton's capacity, honesty, and singleness of purpose, tells in Cromwell's favour, and shows that if Ireton had lived and Fairfax remained true to his first principles, Cromwell's course might have been different from what it was, ii. 192, 193, 306. Cromwell must have known that if he was not what he has been painted by Hyde, and Hobbes, and Hume, neither was he without blemish, as some have painted him; and he had magnanimity enough to bear that the picture of his mind should be a likeness, though an unfavourable likeness, even as he told Lely not to leave out scars and wrinkles in the portrait of his face, ii. 189.

DENBIGH, Earl of, a member of the Council of State of the Commonwealth, whose peerage was created by James I., i. 232.

Dives, Sir Lewis, infuses suspicions of Cromwell's having been bought over by the Court into the mind of John Lilburne, ii. 183, 184.

Dorset, Sir Edward Sackville, Earl of, Clarendon's account of, a strange, dark picture of that time, i. 171, 172.

Dragoons, difference between "Horse" and "Dragoons," ii. 11–13.

EDGEHILL, battle of, i. 275–280.

Eliot, Sir John, his speeches against Buckingham, like Cicero's against Antony, cost him his life, and show that the cause he advocated was beyond the reach of Parliamentary harangues, i. 51, 52, 70.

"Engagement," the, treaty between King Charles and the Scots

Commissioners, by which Charles agreed to confirm the Covenant, and to join with the Presbyterians in extirpating the Independents, ii. 249, 250.

Esmond, Robert, brutal treatment of, by Strafford, which was said to have caused his death, i. 105, 106. Finch's mode of dealing with the evidence in Esmond's case, i. 106, 107.

Essex, Robert Devereux, Earl of; words used by, omitted by Bacon in his published report of the trial on the Tudor Government principle of blackening the memory of its victims, i. 11. Also in the State Paper Office, a paper entitled "Directions to the Preachers," for the purpose of employing the pulpits in the business of blackening Essex's memory, i. 12.

Essex, Robert Devereux, Earl of, son of the preceding, appointed to the command of the army of the Parliament, i. 255, 268. His qualifications for that appointment, i. 268, 274, 278, 279, 284, 302, 303.

FAIRFAX, Sir Thomas, afterwards Lord Fairfax; his character, ii. 3, 4. His account of the battle of Marston Moor, ii. 61, 62, 63, and note. Appointed to the command of the Parliamentary army, ii. 91. Obtains a dispensation from Parliament that Cromwell should command the horse, ii. 144. His personal exertions in the battle of Naseby, ii. 150. His vigour and ability in putting an end to the first civil war, ii. 174, 175; and to the second, 262, 264. His inconsistent conduct afterwards, ii. 303–306. Sat once as a commissioner for the trial of the King, ii. 310. Mischievous effects of his conduct, ii. 306, 310, 311.

Falkland, Henry Cary, created by James I. Viscount Falkland in 1620, and appointed Lord-Deputy of Ireland in 1622, i. 232. His character, i. 233.

Falkland, Lucius Cary, Viscount, son of the preceding, after Strafford's death, when the bill to take away the bishops' votes in the House of Lords was reproduced, said he had changed his opinion on that as well as on many other subjects, and declared his determination to vote against it, i. 231. His character, i. 233–235. He and Hyde oppose Pym and Hampden in the House of Commons, i. 236; became Secretary of State to Charles I. Killed at the first battle of Newbury, i. 310.

Finch, Sir John, afterwards Lord Finch; his character, i. 95–97. An example of his mode of dealing with evidence, i. 106, 107. Impeached by the Long Parliament, but escapes to Holland, i. 184, 185.

Fletcher, Andrew, of Saltoun, his remarks on the battle of Naseby, ii. 151, 152.

GAINSBOROUGH, skirmish at, ii. 35, 36.

Gauden, John, the author of "Icon Basilike," as he states himself in a

letter to Clarendon, printed among the "Clarendon Papers;" stating, moreover, that Charles II. was satisfied that he (Gauden) wrote it, ii. 341. For which service he urgently applied for a bishopric, and was made first Bishop of Exeter, and then Bishop of Worcester, ii. 342.

Godolphin, Sidney, death of, a friend of Sir Bevill Grenville, of Falkland, and of Hobbes, i. 300. Character of, i. 300, 301, and note.

Grenville, Sir Bevill, with Sir John Berkeley, led one of the divisions of the Royalists at the battle of Stratton, i. 298. Killed at the battle of Lansdown, *ibid.*

Grey, Thomas, Lord, of Groby, one of the commissioners for the trial of the King, ii. 301.

HAMILTON, James Hamilton, Marquis and afterwards Duke of, King Charles's Commissioner in Scotland, appointed to command the fleet sent by King Charles for the invasion of Scotland, i. 161. Objects to a scheme proposed by Montrose to King Charles and Queen Henrietta Maria on account of its impracticability, i. 288–290. Raises an army in Scotland and marches into England against the English Parliament in the second civil war, ii. 272, 273. Defeated by Cromwell, 273.

Hampden, John, assessed for his manor of Stoke Mandeville in Bucks twenty shillings for ship-money, i. 125, 126; and resists the payment as illegal, but judgment was given for the Crown, i. 136. One of the five members of the House of Commons whom King Charles impeached and came to the House to seize, i. 242, 243. Effect of a short speech of his in the debate on the Grand Remonstrance, i. 237. Raises a regiment for the Parliament, i. 270. Killed at Chalgrove Field, i. 305.

Harrison, Thomas, Major-General. His wild religious enthusiasm, and his daring as a soldier, ii, 59. Royalist calumny and scurrility respecting, ii. 171.

Haselrig, Sir Arthur, one of the five members whom King Charles came to the House of Commons to seize, i. 242. His remark thereon sixteen years after in one of Cromwell's Parliaments, i. 245.

Hawkins, his case the first instance of torture in England, i. 7, 8.

Henrietta Maria, Queen of Charles I. Her character, i. 287; ii. 250–252. Her name, whether justly or not, connected with the Irish massacre, which was supposed to be part of a vast work of darkness planned at Whitehall, i. 226, 227, and notes. Goes to Holland to pledge the crown jewels for money, ammunition, and arms; and to procure, by the intervention of the Pope's nuncio, 4000 soldiers from France, and 4000 from Spain, i. 252, 253. Scheme of, concerted with Montrose, for having a massacre of the Protestants in England, after the

fashion of Charles IX. and Catharine de Medici's punishment of Paris, of punishing London, the "rebellious city," i. 287–289. Impeached by the House of Commons of high treason—which impeachment afterwards passed the House of Lords also—on the grounds that she had pawned the crown jewels in Holland, that she had raised the rebellion in Ireland, &c., i. 295.

Highlanders of Scotland, ii. 97–113.

Holles, Denzil, one of the five members of the House of Commons whom King Charles impeached and came to the House to seize, i. 242, 243. Raises a regiment for the Parliament, i. 270. Son of the first Earl of Clare, one of the new nobility of James I., *ibid.* His description of the Parliamentary army, ii. 20 and note, 21. Charges Cromwell with cowardice, ii. 73. Attempts to destroy Cromwell, ii. 86, 190, note, 209. Character of, by Mrs. Hutchinson, ii. 228.

Hopton, Sir Ralph, commanded a division, with Lord Mohun, at the battle of Stratton, for which he was created Lord Hopton of Stratton, i. 298.

Horse, difference between "Horse" and "Dragoons," ii. 11–13.

Hutton, Mr. Justice, his argument against ship-money, i. 137 and note.

Hyde, Edward, Earl of Clarendon, see Clarendon.

"ICON BASILIKE," authorship of, ii. 341.

Independents—the party or sect—which became from the abilities of its leaders the most powerful in the war between Charles I. and his Parliament. A most important distinction between the Independents and Presbyterians was, that while the Presbyterians were intolerant of all forms of Christianity but their own, the principles of the Independents were toleration to all denominations of Christians whose religion they did not consider hostile to the State, ii. 77. The distinction between the Presbyterians and Independents in the English Parliament—the former being represented by Essex, Holles, and Stapleton, the latter by Cromwell, Vane, and St. John—may be further seen in this, that it was the object of Essex's party that England should select the men who were to lead her councils and command her armies, not for their fitness, but for their wealth and rank; while it was the object of Cromwell's party that fitness alone should be looked to in the selection, ii. 87. Struggle for power between the Presbyterians and the Independents, ii. 203–210; which ended in the expulsion of the Presbyterians from Parliament by Pride's Purge, ii. 296–298. The Presbyterian majority had passed a vote that all should conform to the Established Church, which was then Presbyterian, which was aimed at the exclusion from Parliament of Cromwell, Ireton, Ludlow, Blake, Algernon Sydney, and other leaders of the Independents,

whereas Cromwell's principle, as an Independent, was not to put force on the conscience of any man, "leaving to the learned to follow the learned, and the wise to be instructed by the wise, while poor, simple, wretched souls are not to be denied a drink from the stream which runneth by the way;" or "a word spoken in season, just perhaps when you are riding on to encounter an enemy, or are about to mount a breach," ii. 204, 205. As a Presbyterian, and liable to be controlled by oligarchs and preachers, Cromwell could not have done his work which he did so perfectly as an Independent with an army of Independents, the soldiers of which, though as regarded military discipline they formed a machine that worked in the highest perfection, in religion and politics refused to submit their judgments to the control of any man or body of men, ii. 212, 213, and notes.

Ireland, Strafford's government of, i. 109–116. The massacre of English Protestants in 1641 in Ireland, usually called the Irish massacre, and supposed to be part of a vast work of darkness planned at Whitehall (see Henrietta Maria, Queen of Charles I.), i. 223–227 and note.

Ireton, Henry, misrepresentations of the Royalists and Presbyterians respecting, ii. 180, 181, 187. His birth, family, and education, ii. 194. "Agreement of the People" and other papers drawn up by him with the assistance of Cromwell and Lambert, ii. 195–197. His military qualifications, ii. 197, 198. His sacrifice of his life by his labours as Deputy of Ireland, ii. 198–200. His refusal of the Parliament's grant to him of £2000 a year, ii. 202. The Remonstrance of the army to the House of Commons demanding justice on the King chiefly drawn up by him, ii. 285.

JAMES I., character of, by no means so easy to decipher as those have supposed who assume that he was simply a fool and pedant; for besides being really a wit, in the quality of mind which enables a man to accomplish his ends he was a match for the ablest men of his time, and in the success with which he involved some parts of his character and some actions of his life in darkness he was not much inferior to Tiberius, i. 27–30. The saying attributed to him, that as he made the judges and the bishops, he made what "liked him law and gospel," came true as to the bishops in the case of Gauden and "Icon Basilike," ii. 341, 342; and as regards the judges, see Bacon's proceedings in the case of Peacham, i. 15; and Popham's in the case of Raleigh, i. 13, 14.

KIMBOLTON, Lord, eldest son of the Earl of Manchester, called to the House of Lords in his father's lifetime, impeached at the

'same time with the five members of the House of Commons, i. 242.

Kings of England, Plantagenets, Tudors, and Stuarts, arts employed by, to render Parliamentary representation a delusion, i. 4–6; transformed by the destruction of the great barons in the civil war of the fifteenth century into Asiatic sultans—torture introduced by, into England, i. 6–20.

King's evil, the piece of gold given to those who were touched for the disease called the *King's evil* accounts for the miraculous cures, great numbers of poor people going to be touched for the piece of gold who never had any such disease as that called the *King's evil*, ii. 260 and note.

LAUD, Archbishop, his character, i. 72, 73. His administration, i. 72–104. Struggle between Laud and Williams for Court favour, i. 80–87. Laud's persecution of Leighton, i. 89, 90; of Prynne, i. 90, 91, 92, 94; of Prynne, Bastwick, and Burton, i. 96–102; of John Workman, 103, 104. His struggle with the Scotch Presbyterians, i. 140, 141, 153–160. His impeachment, i. 184. His trial and execution, ii. 93–96.

Leighton, persecution of, by Laud, i, 89, 90.

Lilburne, John, Lieutenant-Colonel, having been committed to Newgate for publishing a seditious book, confined in the same cell with Sir Lewis Dives, brother-in-law of Digby, and assured by Dives, as if he had received his intelligence from his friends about the King, that Cromwell had been bought over, publishes pamphlets on the subject, and raises a mutiny in one or two regiments, ii. 183, 184, 243, 244. Lilburne's assertions are completely refuted by a letter of Fairfax to the Speaker of the House of Commons, ii. 244, 245; and his accusation of Cromwell of being the murderer of the mutineer shot by order of a court-martial called by Fairfax, was equally refuted by the Attorney-General at Lilburne's trial, ii. 245, 246.

Lilburne, Robert, Colonel, brother of John Lilburne, with 600 horse defeats 1000 under Sir Richard Tempest, in Lancashire, ii. 265.

Ludlow, Edmund, served in the life-guard of the Earl of Essex at the battle of Edgehill, i. 277, note. His character, ii. 193. Was Lieutenant-General of the Horse in Ireland, and, after Ireton's death, Commander-in-Chief in Ireland till the appointment of Fleetwood. During the four years he served in Ireland he expended £4500 of his own estate more than all the pay he received, ii. 202. Falls into some errors respecting Cromwell's negotiations with the King, by trusting too much to Sir John Berkeley's Memoirs, which he had seen in manuscript at Geneva, ii. 181, 182, 229, and note. The measure of turning the Presbyterians out of the House of Commons by force devised

principally by Ireton and Ludlow, ii. 292–298. Ludlow's account of a conference at which Cromwell "would not declare his judgment either for a monarchical, aristocratical, or democratical government, and having learned what he could of the inclinations of those present at the conference, took up a cushion and flung it at my head, and then ran down the stairs," ii. 266, note.

MAESTRICHT, massacre at, by Philip's soldiers under Farnese, when "a cry of agony arose which was distinctly heard at the distance of a league," ii. 214, note.

Manchester, Edward Montagu, Earl of—formerly known as Lord Kimbolton, but become Earl of Manchester by his father's death—joined with Oliver Cromwell in the command of the associated eastern counties, ii. 39. Charge brought against him by Cromwell of letting slip an opportunity to put an end to the war after the second battle of Newbury, ii. 83. Counter-charges brought against Cromwell by Manchester, Essex, and Holles—among which was the charge that Cromwell had said "it would never be well with England till the Earl of Manchester was made plain Mr. Montagu; that the Assembly of Divines was a pack of persecutors; and that if the Scots crossed the Tweed only to establish Presbyterianism, he would as soon draw his sword against them as against the King," ii. 83, 84.

Marston Moor, battle of, ii. 43–78.

Mohun, Lord, with Sir Ralph Hopton, leads a division of the Royalists at the battle of Stratton, i. 298.

Montfort, Simon de, writs issued by, for the return of citizens and burgesses to Parliament, i. 2, 3.

Montgomery, Philip Herbert, created Earl of, by King James, a member of the Rump, and of the first Council of State of the Commonwealth, i. 232.

Montrose, James Graham, Earl and afterwards Marquis of, scheme concerted by, with the Queen, and approved of by the King, of destroying the English and Scotch Protestants by armies composed of Irish, of Islesmen, and of Scotch Highlanders, i. 288, 289. His victories and cruelties in Scotland, ii. 113–127, 138. His massacre of the unarmed citizens of Aberdeen, ii. 121–125. His defeat at Philiphaugh by David Leslie, ii. 165. His character, ii. 167.

Musket, exaggerated notion of its powers when first introduced; its inefficiency from the clumsy machinery for discharging it, and the want of the bayonet, as well as from the ball being put loose into the gun, ii. 117, 118.

Musketeers, proportion of, to pikemen, in a regiment, ii. 14.

NASEBY, battle of, ii. 146–151.

Newbury, first battle of, i. 308–310; second battle of, ii. 82, 83.
Newcastle, Earl, afterwards Marquis of, the King's letter to, commanding him to levy Roman Catholics, i. 272, note. After the loss of the battle of Marston Moor, instantly left England, ii. 74. His character, ii. 74, 75.
Norfolk, Duke of, not allowed a fair trial, but, as he said on his trial, "brought to fight without a weapon," i. 15. The Duke also says, "I pray you let the witnesses be brought face to face to me; I have often required it, and the law, I trust, is so." To which the answer given is, "The law was so for a time, in some cases of treason; but since, the law hath been found too hard and dangerous for the Prince, and it hath been repealed." It had not been "repealed," for even then the Crown had not the power either to make or repeal a law, i. 13.

PARLIAMENT had existed in England for 400 years when Charles I. came to the throne, but Parliamentary government had not been established; Parliament being used by the kings merely as an instrument for obtaining money more easily, i. 23.
Parliament, the, summoned after the battle of Lewes, by Simon de Montfort, who issued writs dated 12th December 1264, requiring the sheriffs to return, besides two knights for each shire, two citizens for each city, and two burgesses for each borough, i. 2–4.
Parliament, the first, of Charles I., i. 43, 44. The second, of Charles I., in which the Lord Keeper told the Commons that if they did not vote a sufficient and unconditional supply, they must expect to be dissolved; and the King said, "Remember that Parliaments are altogether in my power; and as I find the fruits of them good or evil, they are to continue or not to be," i. 48–50. The principal business of the Commons in this Parliament was the impeachment of the Duke of Buckingham, i. 51–55.
Parliament, the third, of Charles I., i. 59. Memorable for having passed the Petition of Right, grounded on Magna Charta, and the numerous statutes confirming it, and on other ancient statutes, i. 60-66; which Petition of Right was to be a dead letter for more than ten years, i. 70.
Parliament, the fourth, of Charles I. met 13th April 1640, i. 163; dissolved three weeks after it had assembled, i. 164.
Parliament, the fifth, of Charles I., known as the Long Parliament, met 3d November 1640, i. 167. Agreement of parties in, at first, i. 168. Proceeds to the redress of grievances, i. 178. Impeachment of the Earl of Strafford, i. 179–183; of Laud, of Windebank, of Finch, i. 184, 185. Punishment of the judges who had upheld ship-money, i. 185, 186. Act for triennial Parliaments, i. 186. Act declaring ship-money illegal, i. 187. Act abolishing the Star Chamber, *ibid.* Act abolishing the

Court of High Commission, i. 188. Acts abolishing the prerogative of purveyance, abolishing that of compulsory knighthood, and determining the boundaries of royal forests, i. 189. Seems suddenly to have divided itself into two great parties immediately after the execution of Strafford, i. 228, 231. The Grand Remonstrance, i. 228, 236–241. The King's attempt to seize five members of the House of Commons, i. 242–245. Prepares for war against the King, i. 250–263. Commencement of the war, i. 264. Passes the self-denying Ordinance, ii. 91.

Parliament, Irish, Strafford's treatment of, i. 110–112.

Parliament, Scottish, by means of the contrivance called "Lords of the Articles," completely in the power of the Crown, i. 149, 150.

Peacham, examined upon interrogatories "before torture, in torture, between torture, and after torture," i. 15.

Pembroke, Philip Herbert, Earl of Montgomery, succeeds his brother as Earl of, in 1630, was a member of the Rump and also of the first Council of State of the Commonwealth, i. 232.

Pikemen, proportion of, to musketeers in a regiment, ii. 14.

Pikes, being from fifteen to eighteen feet long, and of considerable weight, required men of some strength and height to handle them efficiently, ii. 14.

Popham, Chief-Justice, i. 13.

Presbyterians, Scottish, Laud's struggle with, i. 153–160.

Presbyterian ministers' influence on Lady Fairfax, and through her on Lord Fairfax, and the consequences of it, ii. 3, 4, 310, 311.

Presbyterian, the Established Church in England, for a certain time during the Long Parliament, ii. 204, *note.*

Prynne, William, a barrister of Lincoln's-Inn, of great legal learning. His persecution by Archbishop Laud, i. 90–100. His legal argument that neither by the common nor statute law of England could any man lose his ears, or any member but his hand, and that in the case of striking in the King's palace or courts of justice, i. 88, 89.

Puritan, a term of reproach, given in derision to those who did not follow the Court fashions in morals and religion, i. 39. Those called Puritans were also called Brownists by the Court party and the Court poets, who made those persons the subjects of such jokes as seemed likely to be acceptable to their patrons, as "I had as lief be a Brownist as a politician," "If I thought he was a Puritan, I'd beat him like a dog," i. 272, 273. King Charles I. told his army they would meet no enemies but traitors, most of them Brownists, Anabaptists, and Atheists, who would destroy both Church and Commonwealth, i. 272. Whether or not the Presbyterians are to be classed under the denomination of Puritans, it is certain that the Puritans of the Long Parliament, who were the leaders in Parliament as well as in fields

of battle, were not Presbyterians, but Independents, and might derive their denomination from Robert Brown rather than from John Calvin, i. 140, 272, 273.

Pym, John, his speech against the Earl of Strafford at the opening of the Long Parliament, i. 179–181. His impeachment of Strafford, 182. His speech at Strafford's trial before the Lord High Steward and the Peers as chief manager of the impeachment for the Commons, i. 193, 194. His reply to Strafford's defence, i. 204–206. Informs the House of the army plot, i. 209. One of the five members of the House of Commons impeached by the King, i. 242. Said by contemporary writers to have received private information from the Countess of Carlisle of the King's design to take by force the five accused members, i. 245. His death and public funeral, i. 315. The House undertook to pay his debts, not exceeding £10,000, i. 317. Contrast between Pym's public and Hampden's obscure funeral, i. 318, 319.

Raleigh, Sir Walter, not allowed a fair trial; inhuman treatment of, by James I., i. 16–18. "I beseech you, my lords," said Raleigh, "let Cobham be sent for—Good, my lords, let my accuser come face to face. Were the case but a small copyhold, you would have witnesses or good proof to lead the jury to a verdict, and I am here for my life," i. 13. Raleigh's sentence at his trial at Winchester, due to the jury having been packed—the jury first nominated being changed over-night, and others who were to be depended on substituted for them, i. 18. Sir Thomas Wilson, who was employed by James I. to draw confession from Raleigh under the show of sympathy, represents the complaints of Raleigh, who then in his 67th year was suffering from an intermittent fever and ague, and a complication of other painful disorders, as being either wholly counterfeited or greatly exaggerated; and the proof he alleges is, that Raleigh, with whom he pretended to sympathise, sometimes forgot his sufferings, when his powerful mind was led to look back on the actions of his adventurous life, i. 17, 18.

Rupert, Prince, his merits as a cavalry officer, i. 266, 267. Showed considerable strategic ability at Marston Moor, ii. 44, 46, 47. His rapacity and cruelty made him odious even to the Royalists, and merited the description given of him by the Council of State of the Commonwealth in their instructions to Admiral Blake when sent in pursuit of him, of "Hostis humani generis," ii. 66, 67, and note. Cases reported by Admiral Penn of his tyranny and cruelty, ii. 68, note.

Salisbury, William Cecil, Earl of, though his father had been minister of James I., to whom he owed his peerage, was a member of the government called the Commonwealth, i. 232.

Say, Lord, refuses to pay ship-money, and puts in a demurrer to the Constable's plea, that by virtue of the king's writ he did distrain the Lord Say's cattle for not paying the ship-money, i. 135, 136.

Scotland, the people of, "much enslaved to their lords," ii. 272, 273. As to the "pit and gallows," see i. 147, 148, and notes.

Ship-money, i. 117. Payment of, resisted by several persons—by Sir John Stanhope, i. 134; by Lord Say, i. 135; by John Hampden, who engaged Oliver St. John and Robert Holborne as his counsel; and after twelve days' argument in the Exchequer Chamber before the twelve judges, judgment was given for the Crown, i. 136, 137.

Spencer, Lord, letters of, to his wife showing the peculiar position of some of the Royalists, i. 258. Fell at the battle of Newbury, i. 310.

Star Chamber; Crompton, in his "Jurisdiction of Courts" (title, *Star Chamber*), produces no precedents of such punishments as Laud inflicted, i. 89. In the reign of Charles I. the audience assembled to secure places in the Star Chamber at 3 o'clock in the morning, i. 74, note.

Strafford, Thomas Wentworth, Earl of, his character, i. 71, 72, 74, 75. His policy is expressed in the word *Thorough*, used in the correspondence between him and Laud; which word meant that the aim and object of him and Laud were to destroy utterly all remnants of the freedom of the ancient English constitution that had survived the tyranny backed by the rack of the last two centuries; and that the means to that end was the establishment of a standing army in England, i. 118, 119. His brutal treatment of Robert Ermond, i. 105, 106. His government of Ireland, i. 109–116. Impeachment of, i. 182, 183. Trial and execution of, i. 190–221.

TORTURE, never legal in England, i. 7–10. But the English Government was for two hundred years a government of the rack, i. 7–20. First case of, in England, i. 7. In England, torture was not subject to those rules and restrictions under which it was applied in those countries which had adopted the Roman law, i. 8. The habitual use of the rack and other kinds of torture, and the abolition of the ancient rule of evidence, that the accuser and accused should be brought face to face, lead to the conclusion that it was the purpose of the latter Plantagenets, and of the Tudors and Stuarts, to destroy the English constitution, and to substitute what was styled prerogative for the ancient laws of England, i. 10, 11, 13, 33. First case of torture in England, i. 7, 8. Last case of, in England, i. 166.

Turenne, his opinion of Cromwell's soldiers in his army, ii. 21.

VOLTAIRE—had so many of those marks of a lordship or manor indicated throughout Europe by the *furca* or gallows, on an estate he had lately purchased in Burgundy, that he declared he could accommodate half the Kings in Europe, but thought them hardly high enough for the purpose, i. 148, note.

WALLER'S Plot, i. 292–295.

Waller, Sir William, commands under Essex a detachment of the army of the Parliament, i. 297.

Warwick, the Earl of, appointed by the Parliament to the command of the fleet, i. 255.

Williams, Lord-Keeper and Bishop of Lincoln, struggle between, and Laud for Court favour, i. 80–87.

Wilson, Sir Thomas, employed by James I. to entrap Sir Walter Raleigh into words that might inculpate him; being, in accordance with a practice introduced when the Roman imperial tyranny was at its height, shut up in the Tower with Sir Walter Raleigh for upwards of a month for the purpose of drawing from him, under the show of sympathy, materials for a criminal accusation. Directed to draw from Raleigh such information as might promote the objects of the King; his destruction. Raleigh's servant dismissed, and a man appointed by Wilson in his place; Lady Raleigh excluded from the Tower, but permitted to correspond with her husband, and the notes she sent, and Raleigh's answers, intercepted by Wilson's man and sent to the King, i. 16, 17.

Workman, John, lecturer of St. Stephen's Church, Gloucester, Archbishop Laud's unrelenting persecution of, i. 103.

Wren, Bishop of Norwich, reported to have required the churchwardens in every parish of his diocese to inquire whether any persons presumed to talk of religion at their tables and in their families, i. 104.

ZUTPHEN, massacre at, by the Spanish soldiers of Alva, when, in the words of a letter quoted by Mr. Motley, "a wail of agony was heard above Zutphen last Sunday, a sound as of a mighty massacre," ii. 214.

PRINTED BY BALLANTYNE, HANSON AND CO.
EDINBURGH AND LONDON

00047725

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 18 July, 2018